
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



CHRISTIAN
SOCIALISM
WHAT & WHY
SHRAGUE

50c
850
10







3 2044 010 323 368

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM

WHAT AND WHY



PHILO W. SPRAGUE

Soc 850.10



Harvard College Library

Bought with
Money received from
Library Fines.

13 Apr. 1899.

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM

WHAT AND WHY

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

WHAT ARE ITS CAUSES?

WHAT IS ITS RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY?

HOW CAN THE GREAT SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES IT

INVOLVES BE BROUGHT ABOUT BY JUST

AND ORDERLY METHODS?

BY THE

REV. PHILO W. SPRAGUE

RECTOR OF ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

WITH APPENDIX

ADDRESS OF THE BISHOP OF DURHAM ON SOCIALISM

NEW YORK

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY

31 WEST 23D STREET

1891

Box 850.10



Fine money

COPYRIGHT, 1890, BY
E. P. DUTTON & CO.

Press of J. J. Little & Co.
Astor Place, New York

TO

My Mother,

WHOSE PRECEPTS INSPIRED
WHOSE EXAMPLE HAS ENFORCED
ANY GOOD
THESE PAGES MAY HOLD,
I
LOVINGLY, REVERENTLY,
DEDICATE
THIS BOOK.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.	
INTRODUCTORY	PAGE I
CHAPTER II.	
WHAT IS SOCIALISM?	4
CHAPTER III.	
OUR PRESENT ECONOMIC SYSTEM: SPIRIT OF THE SYSTEM	26
CHAPTER IV.	
RESULTS OF THE SYSTEM: WHY SOCIALISTS BELIEVE IN COLLECTIVE OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF LAND	51
CHAPTER V.	
RESULTS OF THE SYSTEM: WHY SOCIALISTS BELIEVE IN COLLECTIVE OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF CAPITAL	64

CHAPTER VI.

CHRISTIANITY AND OUR PRESENT INDUS- TRIAL SYSTEM	99
---	----

CHAPTER VII.

THE MESSAGE OF CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM .	138
--------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REALIZATION OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL- ISM	147
---	-----

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

VERY recently when a prominent advocate of Christian Socialism was discussing the subject with an intelligent business man of Boston, he was somewhat taken aback with the rather contemptuous question: "Christian Socialism? 'And what concord hath Christ with Belial?'" The question certainly suggests the thought which rises naturally in the minds of many when they hear the term for the first time,—that there is an incongruity, amounting almost to an absurdity, between the two parts, Christian and Socialism. The word Christian suggests to them something at all events

tolerably definite. It is not necessary at present to raise the question whether what the word stands to them for is or is not the essential thought of the word. It is enough to say that the word stands to them for something tolerably definite and positive. About the word Socialism they are not so sure. What it suggests to them is something much more vague, less sharply defined and positively colored; but whatever it suggests is radically different from what the word Christian suggests. They are sure enough of their ground for that.

This little book is not intended to be controversial. It is written by one of those who are proud to call themselves Christian Socialists, to show what he understands by Christian Socialism. While the limits allowed will not admit of an exhaustive treatment of even the few points discussed, the author hopes he will be found to have answered the following questions with satisfactory thor-

oughness: I. What is Socialism? II. What are the causes of Socialism? III. What is the relation of Christianity to Socialism, so that there is a genuine Christian Socialism? and, IV. How can the great social and economic changes involved in Socialism be gradually brought about by just and orderly methods?

CHAPTER II.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM ?

SOME words are difficult to define because of their simplicity. Cold, heat, fire, water, earth, air, right and wrong, good and evil are instances of this. It is very difficult to define terms like these which we have come to know by the power of association, and which can be made intelligible to others much more readily by experience than by definition.

Other terms are equally hard to define because that which is covered by them is the reverse of simple. Take the word "civilization," for example. It will be found almost impossible to give a definition of civilization which would convey to any one who has not come into con-

tact with the thing itself any sort of an idea of all that is embraced in the term. Civilization is indeed both a fact and a process. It implies definite stages, but also implies progress from these stages to other stages. It has thus both a constant side and an inconstant side. It implies at one time many things which it does not imply at others.

For the same reason, it is almost impossible to give any thing like a satisfactory definition of Socialism. Take the definition given in Webster's Unabridged, for example, and it would be difficult to imagine anything more delightfully indefinite : "Socialism. A theory of society which advocates a more precise, orderly and harmonious arrangement of the social relations of mankind than that which has hitherto prevailed." A truly comprehensive definition; broad enough, one would think, to embrace the most extravagant and divergent speculations.

But though it is difficult to define So-

cialism, it is not so hard to find what Socialism is. I mean by this that though it is impossible, certainly at the present, to say all that is covered by the word (Prof. Shaeffle, for example, has said that it took him years to familiarize himself with the idea), it is possible to say what the central thought of Socialism is, the thought by which it is Socialism.

To do this one must first get hold of the conception of society which may be called the Basis of Socialism.

We shall see presently that there is a larger and less definite, and also a narrower and more specific use of the word Socialism; but both of these are based upon a conception of society which is so fundamental to the whole system that it may be called the basis of Socialism. Socialists universally conceive of society as an organism. It is not a fortuitous conglomeration of individuals, but an organized body. It is not an association of men and women who have come into

certain relations with each other by mutual agreement; but an organism into which men come naturally and necessarily by birth. The relations to society and to each other into which men come as members of society are as natural and necessary as the relation which a man's eyes, ears, hands, feet, joints, muscles, and nerves bear to his body as a whole and to each other as members of the same body.

But what is it that makes the various parts of which a body consists one body? Plainly the consciousness of unity; the feeling which the body has, which runs through all and every one of its members, that they are one body, actuated by the same spirit and sharing the same life. By this consciousness of unity the body acts as one, calling on every one of its members to co-operate for the common good, and determining its action accordingly. It acts as a whole. It realizes that what concerns

one member, concerns every other member individually and the body collectively, and acts accordingly. If a branch from a tree is about to fall on the head, the body says to the feet, "Run," and the feet run, not simply for their own sake, but also for the sake of the head and the whole body. If excessive light falls upon the eyes, the body may say to the eyes, "Close yourselves," or it may say to the hands, "Shield and protect the eyes." In either case the body acts as one, and issues its commands to the feet or hands not with the thought of limiting their freedom as individual members of the body, but because it is in either case only by so doing that the integrity of the body can be preserved and the individual members be kept capable of exercising any freedom whatsoever.

"Ah, then I see you Socialists mean to solve the vexed question whether society exists for the individual, or the individual exists for society, by the simple

affirmation that the individual exists for society!"

Nothing of the sort; Socialism does not attempt to solve the problem, but simply denies that such a problem exists.

We do not ask: "Does the hand exist for the fingers, or do the fingers exist for the hand? Do the eyes, the ears, the arms, the feet, the stomach exist for the body, or does the body exist for them?" Cut the fingers from the hand and they cease to be fingers. Deprive the hand of the fingers into which it naturally expands itself, and it has ceased to be a hand in its integrity. Separate the members from the body, and they cease to be; and on the other hand the body is not, except as it is the sum of its members,—its integrity is impaired by the loss of one of them. If I say, therefore, the body exists for its members, I am but affirming that it exists for itself; for it is the sum of all its members. And when I say the member exists for the

body, I am thereby affirming that the member exists for itself, for it is a part of the body.

Once get the thought fixed in the mind that society is a living organism of which individuals are members, and it becomes an absurdity to ask the question, "Does society exist for the individual, or does the individual exist for society?"

As I have already said, it is intended to make this book as little controversial as possible. My desire is simply to state the positions of Christian Socialists, and I shall but rarely attempt to defend such positions against objections. The fact to which I now call attention will be found to answer incidentally several objections which may have suggested themselves, but the fact is not stated for the purpose of answering objections so much as for calling attention to a fundamental conception of Socialism; viz., that the state of things which it aims to introduce is to come about naturally, as a

growth, a development, a stage in social evolution. Christian Socialists hold that Socialism can come only when the time is ripe for it; it is possible only in an advanced state of civilization; it has been virtually impossible in the past; it is impossible in many parts of the world to-day; but where possible it is the next step by which society will advance toward its high destiny.]

The fact alluded to is this. It is only very recently—indeed we may say it is within the last century—that society may be said to have waked up to a consciousness of its own existence. Hitherto its development has been largely unconscious, one might almost say, so far as society itself is concerned, haphazard. Even civilized nations have been kept too far from each other to recognize the common life-tie that bound them to each other as members of the same body. In every separate nation the distinctions of classes, each class recognizing its own

interests and having little knowledge of and less sympathy with any thing outside itself,—have produced that phenomenon in the parts which we may call “local sensation;” but have prevented that unification and co-ordination of sensations which may be called “social consciousness.” But of late, through the medium of the telegraph and the press, nations have been brought into closer intimacy with each other, more definite knowledge of what was taking place among other nations than the inhabitants of one village had a century ago of what was taking place in the adjacent village. The steady breaking down of the barrier between social classes has brought out the fact of the common life. Everywhere men and women that have been looking upon themselves as isolated units are feeling the subtile cord that binds them to the living whole. Through the nations beats one pulse—one common nervous system binds all men together and to

each other. Outcast London utters its bitter cry, and it is heard in New York, in San Francisco, in Calcutta. Spain is smitten with the cholera, and the New and the Old World unite in sending aid to the needy and suffering. Rain falls on the parching wheat fields of Minnesota and Dakota, and while the rain-drops are falling they make themselves felt in fluctuations of prices in the exchanges of London and Paris. Of course there has been in reality very much the same community of interests among all the parts of society before, but society is only now becoming conscious of it. I think it may be reasonably said that it is only within the last hundred years that society has begun to say to itself "I, society, am," and to enter upon the career of a conscious, self-determining organism.

This, then, is the Basis of Socialism : that society is a conscious, self-determining organism, able to act for its own

preservation, development, and enrichment as one body including all its members. From this basis it is easy to give a general definition of Socialism. The best way to get at it is to give an example. Take the matter of education. It is easy to see that this can be approached, as in fact it has been approached, from two different standpoints: the standpoint of the individual as an individual, and the standpoint of the individual as a member of society.

Those who take the former standpoint say: "The education of the individual is something that touches the life and concerns the most vital interests of the individual. The man who is educated becomes stronger in the struggle for existence. The man who is not educated becomes weaker. Thus the man who will not be at the personal pains of gaining education for himself and his children puts himself and them at once among the weaker, and must suffer the penalty of

weakness. If his own instinct of self-preservation is not sufficient to induce him to take all the steps necessary for educating himself and his children, it is his own fault and his children's misfortune. In no case is it the business of society. On the other hand, in the long run, society will be found to be the loser by undertaking to educate people of this shiftless class, for it is for the interest of the race that only the strong should survive and that the weak should perish in the struggle for existence."

Those who approach the matter from the other standpoint say: "The individual is also a member of society in whose strength or weakness society is interested as a part of itself. The matter of the education of the individual thus becomes a matter of vital importance to society. Society must undertake it for its own preservation. It must build school-houses, employ competent teachers, and, if need be, enforce the attend-

ance of children. It cannot, for the sake of its own well-being, leave the matter of providing and using the facilities for educating those who are to be the constituent elements of society, even to the self-interest of parents."

To approach the matter thus from the standpoint of society is Socialism. It may be a surprise to many, but it is an undoubted fact that the largest and most practical Socialistic measure which has yet been achieved is the Public School System of the United States.

The broad and general definition which one might give of Socialism would be something like the following : It is the effort of society to perfect its own life and accomplish its own destiny.

The first Socialist was the man who first gave law to a community. When the punishment for murder was taken out of the hands of the friends of the murderer and made the affair of the community, that was Socialism. English Factory Leg-

islation, which said that the health and well-being of the women and children employed throughout England were of sufficient importance to the nation to demand the nation's protection was Socialistic legislation. Sanitary legislation, to which we owe our Boards of Health, with certain recognized powers over the individuals of a community as to their life, habits and surroundings, is Socialistic legislation. So too is temperance legislation, limiting the number of saloons which may be licensed in a town or city, saying at what hours they shall be closed and to whom they shall not sell liquors, or giving local option or prohibiting the sale of liquors altogether. The truth is there has always been more or less Socialism, and men are often Socialists without dreaming of it.* Modern Socialism, in

* This fact has been humorously brought out by Prof. Webb, in his recent pamphlet on Socialism in England (page. 65). "The 'practical man,' oblivious or contemptuous of any theory of the Social Organism or gen-

the broad sense in which I am now using the term, but magnifies and presses to the front the thought which men have never wholly forgotten, of the social side of man's life. It seeks to reach men, to influence men, to benefit men, to ele-

eral principles of Social Organization, has been forced by the necessities of the time, into an ever-deepening collectivist channel. Socialism of course he still rejects and despises. The Individualist city councillor will walk along the municipal pavement lit by municipal gas and cleansed by municipal brooms with municipal water, and seeing by the municipal clock in the municipal market, that he is too early to meet his children coming from the municipal school hard by the county lunatic asylum and municipal hospital, will use the national telegraph system to tell them not to walk through the municipal park but to come by the municipal tramway to meet him in the municipal reading room, by the municipal art gallery, museum and library, where he intends to consult some of the national publications, in order to prepare his next speech in the municipal town-hall in favor of the nationalization of canals and the increase of the governmental control over the railway system. 'Socialism, sir,' he will say, 'don't waste the time of a practical man by your fantastic absurdities. Self-help, sir, individual self-help, that's what's made our city what it is ? ' "

vate men, not simply as individuals, but as members of society.

Of course a term used in any such broad sense as this will include a great deal that is bad as well as good. Indeed every quack who has some legislative nostrum by which the woes and wickedness of men are to be done away may call himself a Socialist, if he choose. Socialism, however, is in no way to be held responsible for the vagaries of all those who are classed among Socialists. From first to last, in trying to come to the heart of Socialism, this ought to be understood as a matter of simple justice.

By applying the principles stated above to the domain of economics, we shall reach the more specific use of the term Socialism.

In the past the matter of providing for the fundamental wants of the individual, food, clothing, shelter, comfort, conveniences,—has been left to the individual. Socialists claim that while providing these

is not the great question of life, it is a fundamental question, on the proper solution of which the being of many and the well being of all depend. They hold, therefore, that it is just as foolish for a nation to use the power of organization, and general concerted effort only when it goes to war with another nation, and not against the common enemies of all its citizens, hunger, thirst, cold, and want, as it would be for the hands, feet, eyes, and all the other members of the body to act in concert when one individual is fighting against another, and then for each member to seek to obtain by its own unaided efforts the food which is necessary to supply its life. Believing this, which follows necessarily from its basal conception of society, for our present system of individual production, of wealth, socialism would substitute a system of collective production ; and as the production of wealth is impossible without the control of land and capital (*i. e.*,

the means of production), Socialism would substitute collective ownership and control of land and capital for individual ownership and control. This is Socialism in the more specific use of the term.

As it is absolutely necessary that any one who hopes to have any intelligent comprehension of Socialism should have this proposition, with, at all events, the most important consequences it involves, fixed in his mind, I give from Prof. Shaeffe's "Quintessence of Socialism" (page 3), his summary of what is meant by the term. It will be remembered that Prof. Shaeffe is authority of the highest kind on the subject, the little book referred to being classic beyond dispute. He says : "The economic quintessence of the socialistic programme, the real aim of the international movement, is as follows : To replace the system of private capital, (*i. e.*, the speculative method of production, regulated on behalf of society

only by the free competition of private enterprises,) by a system of collective capital, that is, by a method of production which would introduce a unified (social or 'collective') organization of national labor, on the basis of *collective* or common *ownership* of the *means of production* by all the members of society. This collective method of production would remove the present competitive system, by placing under official administration such departments of production as can be managed collectively (socially or co-operatively), as well as the distribution among all of the common produce of all, according to the amount and social utility of the productive labor of each.

“ Instead of the present state of things, in which every one who possesses capital freely (*privatim*) undertakes a part of the entire national production for his own private interest, and is socially influenced only by what we may call the

hydrostatic counter pressure of all the other competitors for profit, we should have in the socialistic state the instrument of all the production and distribution of wealth (that is, *capital*, the totality of instruments of production), in the completest sense, the common property of the whole community; whose collective organization would on the one hand associate all the individual and separate labor forces in social labor groups ("collective labor"), and on the other would distribute the wealth produced by this social co-operation according to the proportion of work performed by each individual. Private business, individual enterprise, would be no more. The productive labor of all would be associated in establishments for the purpose of production and exchange, socially managed, equipped out of collective capital, and worked by persons in receipt of salaries, not of private profit and of wages. The amount of supply neces-

sary in each form of production would be fixed by continuous official returns, furnished by the managers and overseers of the selling and producing departments, and would form the basis of the budget of social production. The temporary deficit or overplus of the actual produce as compared with the estimated requirement of each period, would be from time to time readjusted by means of reserved stores, which would then be public and not private warehouses."

Of course this is only an outline of the economic changes which Socialism would introduce; but it is sufficiently definite for our present purposes, and, above all, it is accurate. It gives us the essential thought of economic Socialism; that is, of Socialism, using the word in its specific and technical sense. As Prof. Shaeffle again says: "The Alpha and Omega of Socialism is the transformation of private and competing capitals into a united collective

capital." Without making any further attempt to describe the economic and social changes which Socialism would necessarily cause, I proceed to set forth some of the facts which seem to Socialists good and sufficient reasons for laboring to bring about such a change as this, radical as it is. We ask, that is :

What are the causes of Socialism ?

This necessitates an inquiry into our present economic system and its results.

CHAPTER III.

OUR PRESENT ECONOMIC SYSTEM ; SPIRIT OF THE SYSTEM.

THE limits of this treatise will not allow me to enter into the discussion of this question at all as it deserves. Those who would understand the vehement opposition of Socialists toward our present system (if system it may be called) of production and distribution, must study its analysis as given in the voluminous pages of leading Socialist writers, such as Karl Marx, Lassalle or Lawrence Gronlund. In considering the question, it will be necessary for us to take for granted at least a general idea of the present economic system, which leaves to individuals everything pertaining to the production of the neces-

saries and conveniences of life. We must assume, also, a knowledge of the three constituent elements in production, land, labor, and capital, and also how these stand to each other in our modern industrial and commercial life, where there is almost a practical separation, if not into three, almost invariably into two classes of those who contribute one or other of these elements; while it is left almost exclusively to those who furnish capital to take the initiative in production, and the great mass of those who labor are employed by those who furnish the capital, receiving their share of the product in the shape of wages. We must assume, also, a general acquaintance with the law of supply and demand, by which the profits on capital, the wages of laborers, and the price of commodities are more or less regulated, and of the workings of competition, so far as it goes. With these in the mind of the reader, I

shall proceed at once to point out some of the evils which Socialists believe to be inherent in our present industrial system, and for the relief from which they look toward Socialism. These evils may be seen in its spirit, its practice, and its results.

(1) The spirit of our present industrial system may perhaps best be seen by considering the assumption with which what may be called our orthodox political economists start out as the basis of their interpretation of the system. I call it an assumption, because the masters of the science themselves allow that it is only an assumption. It will not be necessary to multiply quotations to show what this assumption is, but it will be sufficient to give the following from one who may be considered a representative teacher of the subject:

“ Political economy assumes a sort of human nature such as we see everywhere around us, and again it simplifies that

human nature; it looks at one part of it only. Dealing with matters of "business," it assumes that man is actuated only by motives of business. It assumes that every man who makes anything, makes it for money; that he always makes that which brings him in most at least cost; and that he will make it in the way that will produce most and spend least; it assumes that every man who buys, buys with his whole heart, and that he who sells, sells with his whole heart; each wanting to gain all possible advantage. Of course we know that this is not so, that men are not like this; but we assume it for simplicity's sake, as an hypothesis."*

From this testimony it will be seen that the representative interpreters of the present industrial system assume, as the first principle of the system, that in the pursuit of wealth men will act solely and

* Walter Bagehot, "Economic Studies," p. 5.

purely from motives of self-interest. If it is objected that this is not rigidly true, because men do not act, and never have acted, wholly from motives of self-interest, the reply is made that in economic matters we must use our faculty of abstraction, and consider man only as a money-making animal. Thus abstracted he will be found to be guided by this principle. "But in point of fact he does not rigidly so act in his money-making or any thing else, and never has so acted." "That is because he does not act rationally; as he learns to do so, he will so act; for it is normal and rational for man in matters of business to be guided wholly and entirely by motives of self-interest."

In other words, the advocates of the present system not only assume self-interest in the individual as the ruling principle in the production and distribution of wealth, but they hold that it is natural and necessary that it should be so. Of course a great many go much

farther than this, and maintain that an economic system founded exclusively on self-interest of the individual is the best possible system. It has even been cited as a conspicuous instance of the goodness of God that makes the wrath of man to praise Him, that this feeling of self-interest in the individual, when corrected by the necessary competition of other individuals, acting from the same motives, is found to work for the good of all. But, however this may be, it is always taken for granted that the present system is not only natural and necessary, but permanent, because it is based on the principle which is natural and normal and likely to be permanent, that in all economic matters, all questions of business, of buying and selling, all employing or being employed, each individual is to be guided solely and exclusively by the desire to promote his own interests.

It will not take any argument, I think, to show that this really is the spirit of

our present industrial system. It will, however, require considerable explanation to make any one who is not himself a Socialist feel how economically absurd and ethically false this view of the matter seems to Socialists, and particularly to those who call themselves Christian Socialists.

Socialists are usually thought to be revolutionists. They are not nearly so much revolutionists as evolutionists. They base their strictures of the present industrial system (founded as it is upon what seems to them an utterly incomplete and imperfect conception of human nature) as they base their hopes of the coming in of a better system upon some of the plain facts of evolution. We must get hold of these in order to understand Socialism.

In that grand progression of things from chaos to order which is known as evolution, science has shown the workings of a principle which has come to be generally recognized as the "survival of

the fittest." Back of these words lies the thought of a terrific struggle for life that has forever been, and still is going on among things, and this principle which has been manifesting itself and still manifests itself throughout, is that in this struggle for life that lives which is the best fitted to live. The best fitted is not always the strongest. An eyeless race of elephants would be less likely permanently to survive on the earth than a race of creatures greatly inferior to them in strength, but fully equipped with the power of vision. All our knowledge of the past would lead us to believe that the largest and strongest creatures had disappeared in the struggle for existence, and given place to others less huge, but more perfectly organized, and, because more perfectly organized, better fitted to survive in the struggle.

In the evolution of humanity from savagedom to civilization, the same principle manifests itself even more potently and

conspicuously;—it is not the strong simply which survives, but that which is best fitted for humanity's life. Little removed above the brute, the animal instincts of the savage are the strong impulses of his life. Wherever his appetites and passions drive him, there he goes, thinking little of consequences even to himself. He wants food, and when his own supply is exhausted, if he is stronger or more crafty than his neighbor, he helps himself to his neighbor's supply. But a step farther and he has made that weaker neighbor his slave, and set him to foraging for him. His burning lust does not tarry to consider whether the object of his passion is his own mate or that of another. The thought of justice and right is a very weak one in his mind; it rarely asserts itself, and then with but little force. But as the years go on, it may be only after many generations, this thought becomes more influential; it survives in humanity because it is better fitted to survive.

The social instincts of men bring them together. They find by oft-repeated experience that no community can exist without adhering to certain great principles of truth, honesty, fidelity, purity, and these survive because they are best fitted to survive. In course of time there enters another factor into humanity's life. Something in man makes him sometimes think of others as well as himself. Men learn to be friends, to be patriots, to be true lovers of men. It is a very weak feeling at first. Perhaps there is more of real thinking of self than of others at first in many of the deeds that seem conspicuously unselfish, but the feeling gains in influence. It survives because it is best fitted to survive. Its birth was just as natural as that of any other great principle which has been of influence over men. It came from the conscious wants of men and the instincts which lead them and teach them how to satisfy those wants. That a man should act

with regard for the wants and interests of others is just as natural and normal, just as much a fact of human development as that he should act justly when his interests lead him to act unjustly, or wisely when his instincts prompt him to act capriciously or foolishly.

That this is no fancy sketch of the genesis of those virtues which lie at the foundation of all that is good and lasting in our modern civilization, may be seen by comparing the state and condition of the various nations of the world, or by looking at the lives and characters of the individuals in any community.* There are yet to be found tribes and races so barbarous and undeveloped that the only strong voice that speaks to them in their lives is that of their appetites and passions, their fears, and the thought of present enjoyment, their animal instincts. In others we may see the gradual devel-

*See Wake's "Evolution of Justice," Vol. I, *passim*.

opment of the sense of justice and right ; of a clearer view of what is for their own interest, of more patience and greater perseverance in pursuing it. In others the sense of the necessity of law and order has gained a strong influence in the relations of one citizen of a country to another, but the principle of the right of might prevails in the relations of nation to nation. We may say that it is but yesterday that the methods of obtaining justice which for generations have prevailed in the relations of citizen to citizen and man to man, have come to be thought even possible in settling the differences of nation with nation ; and not long since England seemed to many to have lost prestige among the nations of the world because the wise master hand then at the helm would not be driven to settle by the arbitrament of the sword a matter which among individuals would, even in the ruder civilizations of many centuries ago, have been settled judicially.

Among individuals the same tendency is everywhere perceptible. One man obeys his appetite and gets drunk. In a certain stage of development, that is natural. Another man sees it is for his interest to obey the laws and live decently ; he does so, and that is natural too. Another sees that by putting forth all his efforts to do for himself, thinking only of his own gain, buying and selling always and only for his own advantage, he can become rich and powerful ; and this, too, is natural. Yet another comes, and thinking of others as well as of himself, and that, too, in all the concerns of his life, his buying and selling, his labor and his employment of others, he, too, is living a natural and normal life.

It strikes us indeed at first as very absurd that we should use the word "natural" with these so different meanings, and indeed it is so. If, however, we go a little farther into the matter, we shall see the way out of the difficulty. We say

it is natural for a certain man to get drunk, and by this we mean that he obeys the voice of his lower nature in so doing, and when the higher nature is not developed, he would be apt to do so. If, however, that higher nature were developed in him and he should still persist in getting drunk, we should say, not that he was acting naturally, but that he was degrading himself. For that a man should obey the lower motive, no matter how strong, when he is conscious of the higher motives is unnatural and degrading, and not natural, normal, in accordance with the unmistakable tendency of things. In the highest and truest sense of the word, therefore, the sense which alone can reconcile by including all these other senses, man is acting naturally and normally only when he is acting in obedience to the highest law of his nature ; and the highest law of man's nature yet evolved is that he should act not simply with a view to his own interests, but

also with a view to the interests of others.

The trouble with our political economists is that they have persisted in tapping developing humanity at an arbitrary point. They have drawn out a man rationally seeking his own interests, and his own interests only, and have told us : " In buying and selling, in business, however it may be in other matters, this is the norm of our science. This is man in his natural business state. This is the man we are all coming to in business. We have not reached him yet. But the tendency is unmistakably toward him. Under the wise direction of Almighty Providence, we shall yet attain to the measure of the stature of the fulness of this, the ideal, perfect business man."

We shall be met here with an objection, too important to be overlooked. It is this : " This is all very well in theory, but would all be wrong in practice. This is ideal human nature, and with that we

have nothing to do. Our work is the more prosaic one of dealing with actual human nature. We must take men as they are. Political economy does not for a moment say that buying and selling, business, exchanges, etc., are carried on as they ought to be. This is not an ideal world, but an actual world. No doubt men ought to be guided by very different motives from those by which they are guided. But in point of fact they are not. We must take men just as they are."

In reply we say: (1) The political economist, of all people in the world, may not use this objection, for the first principle of his science is the assumption of an abstract humanity as different from actual humanity as light is from darkness. The political economist may not in one breath tell us that the subject of his science is the abstraction "Man the money-making animal," and in the next endeavor to silence all investigation into the real character of his abstraction, its true *quan-*

tus and *qualis*, by saying: "We deal not with man as he ought to be, but with man as he is."

But (2) Passing over the inconsistency of the political economist and admitting that we must take men as they are, we ask, Would any view of human nature as it is be a right and truthful one which did not embrace, beside the tendency to act for one's own interests, also the tendency to do what is just ; and also, in proportion as man develops into his true self, to do what is for the interest of others ?

"*Quid pro quo*," this is the principle of political economy and of exchanges. "A service from you in exchange for a service from me." The man assumed by the economists, moved by the motives which they assume as normal and natural, says to himself: "In making an exchange of services, I must make my service as little as possible, and your service as large as possible. I must always get as much as I can, and give in

exchange as little as I can ; all of which is plainly for my own interest." The question we put is, Would it be taking men as they are to suppose that they were guided solely by this principle? And while it must at once be acknowledged that in the vast majority of exchanges of services this is the main motive, that in a large proportion it is the exclusive motive, yet it is also apparent that it is very far from being the sole motive ; and, more than this, that it is every day tending to become appreciably less so. For with this motive to make the *quid* little and the *quo* big, there is also apparent a distinct desire on the part of man, as he is, to make the *quid* and the *quo* equal to each other ; that is, not to get all a man can, and give in exchange as little as he can, but to make what he gives the equivalent of what he gets ; or, in ordinary language, to do the "square thing," not to beat down, but give the fair price.

This all will admit ; and though many will not admit what we are about to maintain as also true, yet inasmuch as we are endeavoring to take man as he really is, the facts of the case oblige us to put it forth as necessary to its full comprehension ; no estimate of man as he is will be a just and comprehensive one which does not take into account also his distinct desire to do, in a constantly increasing degree as he rises toward the manhood into which he is plainly developing, what is for the interest of others, simply and solely because it is for the interest of others. We may attach less or greater importance to this tendency ; but no analysis of human nature as it is, is complete, which does not take it into account. It is unmistakably one of the facts of the case. Just as any view of a boy of twelve years old which did not take into consideration the tendency of that boy to develop into a man would be an incomplete and

untruthful one, so any theory of exchanges which did not take into consideration this tendency in men to be guided more and more in making them by a desire to promote the interests of others as well as their own interest, is incomplete and untruthful; and, what is of the greatest practical importance, just as any method of dealing with a boy, any practical rules for his guidance, any theory of rational education for him, any principles instilled into him as rational, and normal, which overlooked his tendency to growth into manhood, and proceeded on the supposition that he was to be and forever to remain a boy, would be baneful in the highest degree; so the deductions of the political economists, put forth by them as natural and necessary, which proceed always on the supposition that man is, and is to be forever guided in his buying and selling solely by motives of self-interest, must be false and pernicious.

Our reply, therefore, to the political economist who says we have to do not with men as they ought to be, but with men as they are, is that no theory of men as they are is true and comprehensive which does not suppose them to have at least a desire to do what is just as well as what is for their own interest ; and, more than this, to have also a tendency to do what is for the interest of others distinctly because it is for the interest of others ; and, furthermore, that these motives would seem to be as likely to move men in the great world of business as in any other set of facts in human life.

So much, then, for the naturalness and necessity of our present system. It is natural and necessary only so long as it lasts. It is not founded upon eternal principles of human nature, but only upon principles of an undeveloped and imperfect human nature. It is therefore necessarily transient. Before our pres-

ent system of free contract in industrial matters between individuals came in, another and very different system prevailed, founded on another and very different stage of general ethical development. It was the slave system, under which the master, owning his slave as he owned a tool or beast of burden, used him as such. This no doubt was a step upward; for making slaves of those taken in wars is certainly more humane than killing them, or than killing and eating them. It was more humane, and better economy; and the slave system thus marked a plain general development in humanity and in thrift. Not to dwell on intermediate stages, after many centuries there came another advance. Society (not necessarily all individuals in society, but society as a whole) outgrew slavery. As the result of this ethical development, a system came in which was founded on the recognition of the injustice of force in man's dealing

with his fellow, on human equality, on the right of a man to dispose of his own work, and on the necessity of the consent of the worker when he gave his services to another. Just as soon as there shall be sufficient general ethical advance to recognize the rightness of working for the interest of others as well as for our own interest, another system will come in which shall be founded on the recognition of this principle. This does not mean that every individual living under this system will be inspired by its spirit, or convinced of the goodness of its basic principle, any more than it means that every man who has been a slave-owner shall necessarily be convinced of the goodness of freedom for his slaves, or be actuated by the spirit which abolishes slavery, because his slaves have been emancipated. It simply means that the general ethical development shall have reached this stage. It cannot possibly come till that

time. It will inevitably come at that time.

Such a conception of Socialism as this will perhaps be thought very harmless, for it will seem to postpone the advent of Socialism to the Millennium. Socialists are not moved in the least by the taunt that the system they propose is in the far future, up in the clouds, dreamy, millennial and whatnot. The essential thing with them is that the system is the necessary outcome of a process that is going on in the ethical development of society. The realization of the system may be much farther off than some specially optimistic Socialists hope. It is certainly much nearer than some specially pessimistic individualists believe. But the thing to be noted is that its guarantee is in the moral nature of man, just as the guarantee of the child is in the embryo, and the guarantee of the man in the child.

It would be a great mistake, however,

to imagine that Socialists believe in Socialism simply because it is an ideally nobler system than the present, or because it is founded on higher principles of human nature. Great movements are brought about not simply from ethical but also from economic motives. Revolutions come because the changes made are both right and expedient. Socialists believe in a much nearer advent of Socialism than the Millennium because the present economic condition of society is forcing upon the notice of every one with eyes to see (1) the evils, both ethical and economic, inherent in our present system, and (2) the economic as well as ethical superiority of the basic principle of Socialism. Both of these are to be conspicuously seen in the results of our present industrial system.

CHAPTER IV.

RESULTS OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM : WHY SOCIALISTS BELIEVE IN COLLECTIVE OWNERSHIP, AND CONTROL OF LAND.

IN considering the results of our present economic system we must be careful to distinguish between those facts which can be legitimately claimed as necessary results of the system and those which cannot be proved to be such. That there is, for example, an immense amount of poverty and misery in the world for which those who suffer it are themselves responsible is not an open question. Socialists would not dispute the point any more than the advocates of the present system. They do not

claim that Socialism or any other system would remove the consequences of idleness, shiftlessness, incapacity, drunkenness, or lust. They do indeed claim, which is a very different thing, that Socialism would have a most powerful tendency to remove these causes of poverty and wretchedness, by the change which it would introduce into the spirit of society and the ordinary conditions of life. But in calling attention to the results of the present system, it is not with these incidental results that we now have to do, but with what Socialists claim to be the necessary results of the system.

The persistence of poverty, often of the most abject kind, amongst the great bulk of the people in the richest and most civilized nations of the world, is too big a fact to be explained by the want of power or thrift of the individual. It does not solve the problem to call this one of the "hard facts" of man's lot, or to attempt to show how little after all

there is for each man if the wealth annually produced by the community were equally distributed. Some plain and palpable facts give the lie to any such insufficient estimate of the case; the fact, in the first place, of the enormous and ever-widening contrast between the wealth of the few, and the poverty of the many : and the fact, also, of a constant increase in the wealth-producing power of society, which would seem to have become already sufficient, if rightly used, to lift even the poorest to a considerable degree of comfort, but which is plainly only making the breach wider between the wealth of the few and the poverty of the many.

Socialists see in this fact a necessary result of our present system. They claim that so long as this system remains, it will always be so, and more and more so. With them, it is not a question simply of individual fault or merit ; nor of the niggardliness of nature ; nor of

the hardness of man's destiny ; but the explanation of the real difficulty is that our present industrial system necessarily results in inequality and injustice; its inevitable tendency is to enrich some classes at the expense of the masses.

Of course this is the pivotal point of dispute between Socialists and individualists ; and the position which Socialists take will require to be clearly marked.

The reader is asked to remember what was laid down as the fundamental economic principle of Socialism, namely, the substitution of collective ownership and control of land and capital for individual ownership and control. Socialists claim this is indispensable to the good of society because the *necessary results of general private ownership and control of land and capital is the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many.*

(Of course it is meant that this takes place in a community sufficiently advanced in civilization for the capitalistic

system of production to prevail. It is taken for granted, also, that such community is increasing in population, and advancing in wealth-producing power, as we find to be universally the case with such communities).

(1.) As to Land. In a simple instance, which is not only common but typical, one may easily see the illustration of this.

Smith owns land near a growing city, valued at ten thousand dollars, which he has let for agricultural purposes, and for which he receives a net rental of five hundred dollars a year. To make the case as strong as possible for the advocates of the present system, we suppose that the value of the farm has been imparted to it by actual improvement that Smith has put upon it by his own labor, and that the five hundred dollars a year rent which he receives is only the fair return which he receives for services which he has done in the past. That is,

we raise now no question, such as Socialists would raise for reasons not here given, as to the justice or injustice of the value of Smith's farm and the equity of his receiving rent for it. Let that all go for the present.

The city grows in the direction of Smith's farm ; and people looking about for ground to put their houses on, try to buy a part of Smith's land. Smith, however, refuses to sell at present. He receives each year the rent as the legitimate return for any pains or expense he may have bestowed upon his farm, and waits for others to make him better offers. At the end of ten years he sells the farm for one hundred thousand dollars.

In other words, Smith receives back the original value of his farm, he has each year been receiving what we agreed to call a legitimate return for his investment, in his rent, and he also receives ninety thousand dollars additional.

But whence comes this ninety thousand

dollars of additional value? Has it been caused by any additional labor which Smith has bestowed on his land in the mean time? He has not dug a ditch, or built a fence, or turned a sod, or put hand to spade, or even set foot on the premises. Smith's tenant, meanwhile, has known that he was soon to be turned out, and has been running the farm for all it was worth, till it is actually in worse condition than it was when he took it.

The ninety thousand dollars of additional value has been imparted to the farm by the community. Every man that moved into that neighborhood and set up his workshop, or his factory, or founded his school or church, or built his house, or bought goods and put them for sale at a store, or organized any sort of work by which he could confer some benefit upon the community, added to the value of Smith's farm. Every baby that was born in that neighborhood and required some place where his mother might suckle him,

and some spot for his cradle, however small, added to the value of Smith's farm. There was not a capitalist, however rich, that invested his money in that neighborhood, but contributed to the value of Smith's farm; and there was not a man in that whole community so poor that he did not help, by his very presence, as making one more of the population, to add to the value of Smith's land.

There is nothing accidental about all this. It is as natural and necessary as that a lopped branch should fall or cut grass wither.

Of course innumerable instances may be cited where land has depreciated in value. Just now, for example, there is a great deal of talk about deserted farms in Vermont and New Hampshire, and a multitude of tragic tales may be told of those who have been ruined by sudden falls in the speculative value of real estate in almost every part of the country. Cases of this kind are easily explained,

and do not bear in the least upon the real question at issue.

It must be remembered that we are speaking of countries that are growing in population, in wealth, and in wealth-producing power, which are the only conditions of society with which Socialism concerns itself. Under these conditions a steady rise in the value of the land is universally admitted to be natural and inevitable. Over and above the value which has been added to it by labor in the form of improvements, there comes an "unearned increment." This is true to some degree of land used for agricultural purposes; but as the very conditions mentioned naturally bring a larger and larger portion of the community into cities, this "unearned increment," this additional value which has been imparted to the land on or near which cities are built, assumes proportions which are simply gigantic. And so long as private ownership in land is allowed, it is inevi-

table that this should pass into the hands of the individuals who own the land. The advantages of many people living near each other are so obvious that people will come to live more and more in cities, towns and villages. The advent of many people will enhance the value of the land on which they live, and this enhanced value will pass over into the hands of the land-owners, to be taken out by them in a perpetual tax upon all the members of that community in the shape of rent. In other words, private ownership of the land becomes the means by which certain individuals in the community appropriate to themselves advantages, which, as they have been produced by the community, should go to the community. If the advantages of two million people living together in the city of New York are so great that it gives to the few miles of territory the city covers a value of hundreds of millions of dollars merely for the ground covered, then the

system which allows a comparatively insignificant number of individuals to own this land and to appropriate these advantages to themselves by demanding and receiving rent for its use, seems to Socialists systematized robbery. What the community makes, the community should get. For one man to appropriate another man's makings or earnings had for centuries been deemed both wrong and illegal; yet this very wrong was incorporated into law and life in the slave system. By our present industrial system a small number of land-owners are able to appropriate a large portion of the makings of the whole community. We virtually legalize our own spoliation.

And, worse than this, by allowing the ownership and control of the land to remain with individuals, we mortgage to them and their successors all the possibilities of the future.

There is absolutely nothing in economics more certain than this. If the pop-

ulation of the United States is a certain number of millions, and the value of the land a certain number of billions of dollars, then when the population shall have increased to twice as many millions, the value of the land, apart entirely from all value added to it by labor for improvements, will have increased at least in the same proportion. In other words, the mere increase in population will have brought billions of dollars into the pockets of the land-owning class without one stroke of work on their part to justify it. The community as a whole will have robbed itself to that extent by the system which it has legalized.

The above is necessarily a very imperfect presentation of all that may be said in defence of the position of Socialists on the Land Question. The reader who is anxious to see the full strength of their position on this particular point, is referred to the eloquent pages of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," with

whom, so far as he goes, they are in substantial agreement. At this particular point, however, Socialists part company with Mr. George ; for they hold that the injustice which necessarily results from general ownership and control of capital in private hands for private ends, is certainly as great as the necessary injustice resulting from private ownership of land. I proceed, therefore, to show what Socialists believe to be the necessary evils of our present system:

(2.) As to Capital.

CHAPTER V.

RESULTS OF THE SYSTEM : WHY SOCIAL- ISTS BELIEVE IN COLLECTIVE OWN- ERSHIP AND CONTROL OF CAPITAL.

PERHAPS this is the best place to remove a misunderstanding very prejudicial to Socialism, viz., that Socialism abolishes any such thing as property : that it involves a community of goods, and an equal distribution of what wealth there is now, without regard to present ownership, and a periodical redistribution of wealth, as the energetic and thrifty shall secure larger portions than the lazy and improvident. Nothing could be farther from the mark. Socialism does not aim to destroy private property. On the con-

trary, it seeks to establish the sacredness of property ; for as a system it has for its vital principle the securing to every man of that which rightfully belongs to him.

Socialism does not involve common ownership of wealth, but only collective ownership and control of capital ; that is, of wealth employed in production. This distinction is fundamental, and cannot be too stringently insisted on.

Another misunderstanding must also be removed at this point,—viz., the notion which many people have that Socialism makes very little of capital. Some have so thoroughly misunderstood the position of Socialists on this matter that they have imagined Socialists intended to abolish capital and carry on production without it altogether. No idea could be farther from the mark than this. In reality Socialists make so much of the function which capital plays in production,—it seems to them an instrument of such tremendous power for good or evil

in the advanced industrial stage we have reached, that it is alike too precious and powerful for society to neglect to use consciously and purposely for its own good.

I want to show now, in as brief a space as may be consistent with clearness, why Socialists believe that in our present stage of industrial development general private ownership and control of capital necessarily results in injustice to a large portion of society and to society as a whole.; and that the full benefits of the wonderful progress the world is making can only be secured to society and all the members of society by a system of collective ownership and control of capital.

(1.) As in presenting the Socialist position with reference to land, let us take a common typical case. Its value as an illustration comes, of course, from the fact that it represents the natural workings of our present industrial system under ex-

isting industrial conditions. Let us take the introduction of labor-saving machinery into the process of manufacturing, and see what are some of the results which naturally follow.

B., we will say, invents a machine by which some process in the manufacture of shoes is much facilitated, and A. is a manufacturer engaged in the manufacture of shoes. As it will require capital to make use of the machine, A. will be able to make favorable terms with B. for the use of his machine ; in fact, experience shows that it is very rare that the man whose brain invents a machine that is to benefit the entire community receives much for his invention ; it is the man who first puts capital into it that reaps the golden harvest. This, however, in passing. Why does A. desire to use B.'s machine ? Manifestly because by so doing he will be enabled to manufacture shoes with less labor. By the use of this labor-saving machine ten men, or

perhaps as many girls, in his employ can do the work which it previously required one hundred men to do. A. therefore discharges the ninety workmen ; and supposing him to sell shoes at the same price as before, he will add to his profits what would have gone to those ninety workmen as wages. He may continue to do this so long as he only has the patent right to use this machine. Or he may take a different course. Instead of making the same number of shoes at less cost to himself and selling them at the same price, he may make more shoes and secure a ready market for them by selling them at a little lower price, as he would very easily be able to do, and still make large profits. Experience seems to point to this as eventually the more profitable course. In this way the whole community also gains, for they can have shoes now by giving a little less in exchange than heretofore. The workmen will also gain in this way ; as consumers,

that is, of shoes. In either case, so long as the patent right to use the machine is held by A. he will be the great and almost the exclusive gainer by its use. When, however, this right has passed out of A.'s hands, the question presents itself: to whom does the principle which has been embodied in the machine, and which is the real thing of value, belong? There can be but one answer to this question. It belongs to the community. The position of Socialists is that the community will not get, and cannot get, all the advantages of its use, unless as a community it makes use of it.

The same is true of the thousands of things that make so large a part of the difference between civilization and savagedom. It is amazing how large a part of that which is of essential use to man consists in that intangible wealth, the arts and sciences, the inventions and discoveries, the methods and processes, the adjustments and contrivances, the

certainly that a thousand things have been done, and the knowledge how they can be done which are the property of the whole community. It is this which makes possible the sudden, Phenix-like, recovering of nations from those terrible destructions of capital which would seem at first likely to plunge the whole nation into wretchedness. Suppose, for example, that to-morrow, from some violent upheaval of nature, there were to be such a destruction of capital (accompanied with no loss of life) as should surpass the destruction wrought by our civil war combined with the great fires that took place more than a decade since in Chicago and Boston. Though it is not to be doubted that there would be much immediate want and suffering, yet to one who has not observed the course of events elsewhere under similar circumstances, it is incredible how rapid would be the recovery which the whole community would make. There would be such a stimulus to produc-

tion as would set the wheels of trade in motion everywhere. Men who had been unemployed for years would find ready work, and receive good wages. Those who had been living lives of idleness, never doing a hand's turn but spending the thousands of their incomes as they pleased, and in many cases seeing them continue to accumulate, however fast they were squandered—would go to work also. Society, from the highest to the lowest, would toil terribly, and wealth would be produced as if by magic. In a decade almost the only sign which would remain to mark the great catastrophe would be the fact that the wealth was differently and more evenly distributed. All this would be possible simply because in spite of the destruction of capital two essential things would remain, first the hands and brains to work, and next the science and skill which have been gradually accumulating in the world since man first trod upon it. Destroy

every steam-engine in the world, and we should yet know how to replace them to-morrow. Destroy all the forms of mechanism by which man, aided by the powers of nature, is able to do so much more than he could dream of doing without them, and the community would be but little poorer ; for the knowledge and skill which are the common possession of civilized society would enable us in a short time to replace them with other forms in which the same principles were embodied.

Indeed, it is a surprise to learn how small, after all, is the aggregate wealth of the world compared with what is annually produced. In even the richest communities, the accumulated wealth does not exceed, it may be doubted if it even reaches, the product of three years' work.

Now unless the community shall make use of this intangible wealth by assuming the ownership and control of the tangi-

ble forms in which it is embodied and by which it is utilized, that is, of capital, undoubtedly it is for its advantage that some member or members of the community should do so. Socialists admit this. They are willing to acknowledge the need there has been and still is of a capitalist class, who when the state or municipality, (society, that is, in some of its natural forms,) has not been ready to take up and use for the common good that which should be used wholly for the common good, have for private gain undertaken to make use of just such intangible wealth as the principle I have mentioned. Capitalistic production is without doubt one step in economic evolution. What Socialists maintain is that we have come to that stage of capitalistic production, when on the one hand we are led by the advantages it has revealed of the principle of association to adopt a system which shall make use of that principle on a larger and freer field; and on the

other are driven by the wrongs and disadvantages which the system in its advanced state has also disclosed to abandon the present system as one society has outgrown.

In order to see this, let us follow out a little farther the case we have been considering of the introduction of some labor-saving contrivance, mechanism or principle into the process of manufacture. When the right to the exclusive use of the principle embodied in A.'s machine has passed out of his hands, it is evident that all the employers who are engaged in the manufacture of shoes will adopt the principle from motives of self-interest; it is also evident that there will ensue a discharge of the workmen whose services will be performed by the new machines on the part of every employer. This is the immediate consequence. What may eventually ensue, when, by possible lowering in the price of shoes which may result from the competition of manufactur-

ers among themselves, there may result an increased demand for shoes and for shoemakers—is not now the question. The fact which stares the discharged laborers in the face is that they are out of work. They must compete with other laborers for a place to work and thereby help to bring down the rate of wages of their fellow-workmen and of the whole class of wage-receivers.

From this simple instance, then, we come to a principle as well established as any truth in the whole realm of economics. It is this: the immediate result of every discovery, or invention, or contrivance, by which the same productive result can be accomplished with less effort of human strength or skill, or greater productive results be accomplished with the same effort, is to throw working people out of employment, and thereby put the laboring class more and more at a disadvantage in its relations with the capitalist class. But inasmuch

as this increase in wealth-producing power by the use of these labor-saving contrivances is a necessary element in industrial development, this process becomes continuous. More and more the giant forces of nature take the place of the force man was once required to exert; more and more mechanism does the work which once required human strength and skill. And thus more and more those who control these giant forces, and this wonder-working mechanism gain power over the lives and destinies of those who work, till the man who owns and controls a mine or factory which he may run or close at his pleasure often becomes as absolutely the master of the laborers he employs, as though they were legally his slaves.

Nothing is easier then to talk of economic harmonies, and specially of the harmony between labor and capital. Such talk is very plausible and captivating. It has an air of going down to the first

principles of things by showing that capital is after all only tools, implements, things that laborers use to make labor more effective. The trouble is such talk does not take into account the radically different conditions of production which prevail in our modern world. Under these conditions the tools, implements, etc., have become complicated machinery, within the individual reach of a comparatively small portion of the community. Now the worker is no longer master of his tools, but the machine or rather the machine-owner becomes master of the worker. It is no longer a case of harmony between labor and capital, but of clashing of interests between the laborer and the capitalist. Naturally it would seem that the more perfect the tool with which a man worked, so that greater effectiveness was given to his labor, the better for him and for the community. But under the changed conditions of advanced capitalistic production, the more

perfect the machine, the more is the laborer at the mercy of the man who owns and controls it. It necessarily results in that most pitiful of spectacles, a large portion of the able-bodied workers of a community begging for work.

I am not describing any imaginary consequences in saying this. Just these results have taken place and are to-day taking place. I have but to refer to the sad circumstances which forced the British Parliament into successive efforts to check these results by one measure after another of its Factory Legislation to prove this has been so in the past; and we have only to look about us to see it is so to-day. The unemployed are a great army. The Eighteenth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, which deals with but one subject, the unemployed in Massachusetts in 1885, gives us some intimation of how great this army must be from what it tells us as to Massachusetts, one of the

richest and most prosperous commonwealths in the Union. "As the essential result of this investigation," says the last page of this report, "it may be stated, then, that out of a total of 816,470 persons employed in gainful occupations in this State, 241,589, or 29.59 per cent. were unemployed at their principal occupation, on an average 4.11 months during the census year, the average unemployment for persons engaged in manufacturing pure and simple being 3.90 months; in short, that about one third of the total persons engaged in remunerative labor were unemployed at their principal occupation for about one-third of the working time."

Such a statement as this is a terrible indictment of the system which makes it possible. Make all due subtraction for the cases where the fault is that of the individual worker; allow for laziness, or inefficiency; for want of thrift, or skill, or pluck, or push, and there still remains an

army of the unemployed who have been thrown out of work by the very advances in industrial development which ought to lighten their toil and sweeten their lives. But think what this "out of work" means. Think of the evil thoughts which rise spontaneously in idle brains, and the mischief which idle hands are tempted to do. The man who has been walking the streets all day looking for work, going to every possible opening to be met only with the same reply everywhere, "Nothing for you to day," is not likely to prove a good citizen or neighbor, specially in a country whose Constitution tells him "all men are created free and equal." He will be apt to lose self-control and become dangerous; or self-respect, and become contemptible. More than this, the existence of an army of unemployed reacts upon those who are still employed. It tends to lower their wages. It tends to make the workers themselves more and more subservient to those upon whom

they are more and more dependent. It tends to make the mass of the population mere "hands" to be worked by those who control the instruments of production, without access to which the very gains which society has made in wealth-producing power render production economically impossible.

Here, then, is the first great evil which Socialists claim necessarily results from private ownership and control of capital. It makes the laboring class in the community more and more dependent upon the employing class, who control the instruments of production,—a result prejudicial to the best interests both of employers and employed, and specially in a democracy fraught with perpetual menace to society.

(2.) But it is said that any disadvantage of this sort is more than counterbalanced by the advantages which the laboring class, in company with all the rest of the community, will gain as consum-

ers. "Look," we are told, "at the cheapness of things; articles which only the rich could once obtain are now within the reach of even the very poor."

It would indeed be strange if no such result as this had ensued. What with steam and electricity, with railways that span the continents, and steamers that cross the ocean in a week, with lands blessed with a virgin soil of unequaled richness opened to cultivation and made to lay down their treasures over the world, with machinery by which a child can do what once baffled the strength of a score of men, with mechanism brought to such perfection by the skill and thought of successive workers that it does the work of one hundred hands, with all the wealth of invention, knowledge, science, arts and skill that have come down to us from the past, is it deemed a matter of surprise that there should be some advantage to every member of society in

the lowered price paid for the necessities and conveniences of life ?

Let us admit at once that there has been a gain to society. Let us admit that this gain would have been impossible without capitalistic production. The question now is, "Does the system do for the community all that it may reasonably be expected to do?" And still more urgently than this the question is, "As this present system culminates, as we see it every day tending toward a culmination, does it hold out the promise of giving to the community all that the community is entitled to gain from the priceless heritage it has received from the past?"

To what do the advocates of the present system look for any advantage they may hope the community will get from the present system. Manifestly it is not from the conscious motives and intentions of the capitalist class. It is from something which has been generally true

of this class, under circumstances which are assumed to be similar to the present, viz., that in their anxiety to secure the market for the goods which they are able to produce with ever-increasing cheapness they will compete with one another, and so the price of goods be steadily reduced.

But suppose the kings of capital decline to compete ?

There is a great outcry just now, particularly from many biters who have been bitten, against trusts, syndicates, monopolies, over-grown corporations, *et id omne genus*. Those who raise the outcry fail to see that they are complaining of the natural and necessary results of a system which they have been upholding and still uphold. If five, ten or one hundred manufacturers find it is for their interest to combine rather than to compete, it is difficult to conceive of anything in our present system which justifies the community in attempting to compel them to

compete. When, for example, the sugar trust was recently formed, and as the result the price of sugar was raised nearly a cent a pound for every man, woman and child who used sugar in the United States because the sugar kings thought there was more money in making less sugar and selling it at a higher price than in making more sugar and selling it at a lower price, they were only perfecting our system, not violating it in the least. Why reproach them? Their object in engaging in the manufacture of sugar was not to make sugar for society, or to make good sugar, but to make money. Their object in combining with each other was the same. If they had entered into competition with each other their object would have been just that. Competing or combining, making much or little sugar, discharging hundreds of workmen at a time and closing up one or more mills, or engaging additional workmen and opening up new mills and refin-

eries, raising the price or lowering it—from first to last, the motive is the same: to make money for themselves, and only to serve society with sugar as that shall help them to their money making. Society will find it very hard to prevent such combinations so long as there is money in them, till it changes the system of which such combinations are the result. To make the attempt is a good deal like jumping off from the top of a five-story house and expecting to stop in the air ten feet from the ground.

But the truth is, we have reached the stage in industrial evolution when not only are these combinations natural, but, paradoxical as it may seem, the community will in many cases, on the whole, suffer less loss by such combinations than it would by competition. If I had a lion and a tiger domiciled in my house, I would prefer to keep peace between the two, even if I had to feed them both liber-

ally, rather than have them perpetually fighting.

What is it that makes such combinations possible? As long as the instruments of production belong to each producing workman, such combinations are plainly impossible except in some rare instances, for they would imply combination between vast numbers of individuals widely separated by space and circumstances. But as the instruments of production come to play a larger part in production, come to be more and more impossible for the individual workman to obtain, come to belong more and more to a capitalist class, the advantages of unity of control and management become more and more apparent, and bring larger and larger amounts of capital under the control of individuals or corporations. Combinations now become much more practicable; and in proportion to the greatness of the masses of capital involved, competition becomes more and more fatal

to the competitors, and injurious to the community. For though the community may rejoice for a time in the lowered prices which such competition may bring, it is not for the common interests that capital shall be put out where it is not needed, and still less that it should be wasted. Such losses have to be made good, and they are made good out of the community. But we are likely to have less and less of this sort of competition and still less of what may be called healthy competition. Combination has become the order of the day. The system itself has brought it to our door. The system has trained men in every way for combination. The wealth set apart to aid production, (obtained in many cases, it is true, by systematic robbing of the laborers for a century of industrial development) is on hand to be massed. The giant forces of nature which men have been gradually taming till they are submissive as a gentle child, and the

myriad-handed mechanism through which these forces do their work can best be used when production is on a great scale, which thus makes the massing of capital advantageous. The ability not only to mass capital but to manage it when massed has come as it was needed, till competent overseers and managers are found in every line of industry. And above all industrial habits and the power of systematic work, the adaptability to organization and capacity to do what the place assigned demands have been developed among the mass of the people, till combinations on the greatest scale for industrial purposes have become possible. Thus the system has made industrial combination practicable, it has made it advantageous, it has forced it upon us.

The economic question of the day is not whether combinations shall be tolerated, but whether we shall have combinations of the few to fleece society, or a

combination of all the members of society to benefit all the members of society.

The broken reed of competition is thus slipping away from us, but what a poor miserable broken reed it was at best for society to lean on! By doing so, society virtually stultifies itself; for it tacitly affirms that there is not a public conscience and a public intelligence which is capable of using wisely and justly what belongs to the public and should be used for the public good.

What does society now do with the priceless heritage of intangible wealth which has come to it from the labor, the pain, the sore travail, the hope deferred, the consecrated energies, the patient efforts of the heroes and martyrs of humanity, by which this wealth has been accumulated? It says to those who have wealth: "Use this public wealth and make what you can of it. Use it, if need be, to grind down the great mass of humanity who have no wealth, but give the

labor necessary to produce it,—use it to grind these workers down so that they will give their services not for what those services make, but for what they can get for them. Use it to pile up your millions, so that you and your descendants may live in idleness. Use it to make yourselves more and more absolute masters of the lives and destinies of your fellow-beings, till they shall stand in abject terror before you, lest you should close your factory or your mine, and reduce thousands of them, by a stroke of your pen, to ruin and starvation. Use this priceless inheritance that belongs to me, and all I, society, will ask of you for its use, are the crumbs which may fall from your table in the shape of a possible reduction of the price of commodities likely to happen if you will only be kind enough to compete among yourselves.”

Society would certainly seem to have reached that stage of development where it is more reasonable to trust to a sys-

tem of conscious co-operation for the common good than to such a broken reed as this.

To sum up, then, the results of this branch of our inquiry, the reasons why Socialists believe that a collective ownership and control of capital should gradually be made to supersede private ownership and control of capital are these :

(1.) Because our present system has shown us the overwhelming advantages of association and co-operation in production as opposed so competition ; and collective ownership and control is but a step farther,—to general association, and general co-operation for the common good, from fractional combination for private profits.

(2.) Because, in advanced capitalistic production, capital in private hands becomes a two-edged knife which with one edge cuts from the laborer as producer, and with the other from every member of the community, as consumer. The

stronger and sharper the knife, the larger the slices capitalists will be able to cut from the community on the one hand and the workers on the other. And this result is not accidental but necessary. As long as it is left to individuals to own and control capital in which shall be embodied the wonderful forces and almost magic-working mechanism which represent the toil, patience and ingenuity of past generations, so long will they be able, on the one hand, to appropriate a large part of the benefits which should go to the entire community, by combining among themselves to maintain prices above actual cost ; and, on the other, to take from the laborers a large portion of the product of their labor.

In speaking as I have in the preceding pages of the results of our present industrial system, and particularly of private ownership and control of land and capital, I would not be misunderstood as saying that there has not been progress

under it, and general progress, too. I have not said that the rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer, for the very good reason that I do not believe they are; what I have said, therefore, is no attempt to explain this. Nor have I raised the question whether what progress has been made, has been made by the system or in spite of the system. What I have attempted to show in my criticism of the system that the system itself explains is this very different fact, about the reality of which there can be no sort of reasonable doubt. It explains the persistence of widely extended and often abject poverty in spite of progress. It explains the widening gulf between the rich and the poor. These are the natural and necessary results of our industrial system. As long as that system prevails, we may expect to see the contrasts presented in Christian London between the East End and West End, in cultured Boston between the Back Bay District, and the North

End, in charitable New York between Fifth Avenue and the Five Points, and to see these contrasts intensified. It is the system which makes it possible for thousands of dollars to be spent on a single dinner party at Newport at the very time the coal-miners of a district of Indiana were living on horse-flesh. It is the system which makes it possible for one man to die leaving a fortune of \$100,000,000, while thousands of workmen who have added something to the wealth of the world over and above what they have received every day they have had an opportunity to work, find their last home in the Potter's Field. It is the system which turns the workman into the tramp in search of a job. It is the system which brings multitudes of working girls to their ruin in our great cities, by forcing upon them the choice between sin and starvation. It is the system which brings about the widespread misery, the despair, the frequent

suicides which come from our regularly returning financial crises ; for when production to satisfy the wants of a whole community is left to the judgment of individuals without the carefully prepared data which only the official work of the community itself could furnish, how can there help being over-production here, and under-production there, gluts and speculative valuations, collapses and financial panics, such as we see every decade or two? It is the system again which breeds the restlessness, the uncertainty, the fierce avarice, the cut-throat competition, which do so much not simply to make the lives of multitudes miserable, but to disturb the orderly course of varied labor necessary for the supply of human wants.

These evils are the necessary results of our industrial system, and because they are in the system nothing will cure them save a change in the system. Individuals here count for next to nothing.

The justice of this or that capitalist which may lead him to share his profits with his employées counts for about as much as putting a drop of pure water into a bucket of filth. The system itself must be purified if we are ever to hope for better results. One present system is based upon a low and unworthy conception of human nature, and tends to make human nature low and unworthy. I am not trying to minimize, still less am I ignoring the fact of ignorance, imperfection, sin, call it what you please, in human nature. But though it is impossible to "bring golden conduct out of leaden instincts," there are conditions which tend to bring what gold there is in human nature to the surface, and there are also conditions which scatter it, bury it, to all practical intents and purposes annihilate it. We pray "lead us not into temptation," but our industrial system forces men into temptation. Did not the slave system lead men into temptation? The condi-

tions which it brought about almost forced the slave to become servile and the master to become self-willed, passionate, and tyrannical. To say nothing of the temptations which the system makes by the inequalities of opportunities and enjoyments which it causes,—temptations as fatal to the very rich as to the very poor, how can a system which founds itself directly upon the principle that a man is in no way, shape, or manner his brother's keeper, be anything else than detrimental to moral development? The advocates of our present individualism in industry would do well to remember that the man who first asked the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" was a murderer.

I pass on from this point to the third branch of our inquiry, viz.,

(3.) What is the relation of Christianity to Socialism, so that there is a genuine Christian Socialism?

CHAPTER VI.

CHRISTIANITY AND OUR PRESENT INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM.

By way of introduction to this branch of the subject, attention is called to a much misunderstood text of Scripture : "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you."* The text has been a stumbling-block to many, because they have persisted in looking at it in a narrow and arbitrary way, and finding it fail of realization as they interpret it, they have become sceptical as to its truth. They would have the text mean this : "Be religious and you will be rich,

* St. Matt. vi. 33.

Go to church, profess yourself a Christian; believe in Christ ; and as a reward for this God will bless your substance with increase, and your barns shall burst with plenty."

Such an interpretation of the text puts it out of harmony with all the teaching of Jesus. What He meant by it was this, that there are higher and nobler things in life for men to think of and live for than getting rich, questions of righteousness, justice, mercy and love, all that is embraced in the term Kingdom of God, which one of the most sincere followers of Jesus defined to be, "Righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." Men ought to live for these things, the Master said, and then, with a logical instinct which saw effects in their causes, He told His followers that living for these highest things in sincerity and truth was the surest way to bring in the other lower but necessary things in greater abundance. In other words, the largest wealth

would not come to any nation or community from directly seeking it with an all-absorbing intensity, but it would come as a natural and necessary consequence to that nation or community that exalted above all wealth-getting the exercise of justice, truth, mercy, and love. Taken in this way all experience verifies the truth of the statement of Jesus. It took a great many hundreds, perhaps many thousands of years for men to learn that honesty is the best policy. Yet I do not believe any rational man would question the statement to-day. We may go even further than this, and say that there are very few who would question the statement that justice pays; that a community where business was transacted with a constant regard to justice would naturally and necessarily come to be a richer community than one where acts of injustice in every form were practiced. Jesus plainly meant both of these now well-established ethical facts when He said,

"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Did Jesus mean any thing more than this in these words?

If it can be shown that Jesus always included in the words "Kingdom of God" something beside honesty and justice, another element, another motive, would it not seem to follow that seeking this first must tend to make the world richer, just as much as seeking to do what is honest and just?

What is the great living principle at the heart of Christianity?

(1.) As a matter of history, Christianity founds itself upon the doctrine of the incarnation.

In a book of this sort, all argument to prove that the doctrine of the incarnation rests upon a basis of fact would be out of place and unnecessary. Whether the Christian world is right or not in its belief in the divinity of Jesus is not necessary to our inquiry, so long as, with all

but unanimity, through all the ages since His appearing, Christians everywhere have believed in it. It is with this belief we have to do, not with its legitimacy. Christianity has founded itself upon the doctrine of the incarnation and it is this doctrine which we must interpret.

We can remain in no doubt as to what the doctrine of the incarnation is. From the earliest Christian times, simple forms of words, called creeds, have been used by Christians in their public worship and private devotions to express and enforce belief in this doctrine. In one of these, the earliest, the Christian is taught to say "I believe in Jesus Christ, God's only Son, our Lord." In a longer creed, which dates from the year 325, the doctrine is more explicitly stated. "I believe," says the Christian, "in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God out of God, Light out of Light, very God out of very God, who for us men and for our

salvation came down from heaven and was made man."

Jesus was a Jewish mechanic, born at Bethlehem, in a stable, where His cradle was one of its mangers ; and brought up in Nazareth, where He exercised the trade of a carpenter. At the age of thirty He gave up carpentering and devoted Himself to teaching; but His teaching was of such a kind that His compatriots rose tumultuously against Him, and after three years of public life He was put to death by the cruel Roman punishment of crucifixion.

Yet about the life and words of this Jewish mechanic was something so divine that His immediate followers were convinced that in a pre-eminent and peculiar sense He was the Son of God ; that, in a special and peculiar sense, God was in Him, that He was God's revelation of Himself to man, God's Word, so that the disciple who knew Him best could say of Him, " In the beginning was the Word.

and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us."

And not only were the immediate followers of Jesus convinced of this, and handed down the belief to those who came after them, but they devoted themselves to persuading men of the truth of what they believed ; and, on substantially the same evidence, namely, the story of the life, character and words of Jesus, for the eighteen hundred years which have since elapsed this belief has been accepted by a constantly increasing portion of the world, and by that portion which has attained a higher, more real and lasting civilization than any other part of the human family has ever reached.

Accepting, then, the incarnation as the basis of Christianity, what should it mean for a Christian ?

The answer is very simple. It means the love of the highest for all, even the lowest. So it was interpreted by Jesus

Himself. "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son." So it must ever be interpreted. Every Christian reads in the life and death of Jesus the supreme manifestation of God's love. But this can only mean that "God is love." That is to say, the nature of the highest and holiest—the Almighty—is to love. But if this is true of God, it must teach us the essential goodness of love. Love is the supreme manifestation of the highest ; that is, of God ; therefore love must be the highest to which human character can aspire, and to which it must seek, so far as possible, to assimilate itself.

Moreover, the love of God, as manifested in the incarnation, took a peculiar form, that of self-sacrifice. "He emptied Himself," says the sacred book of the Christian. "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich,"

Whatever else the incarnation may teach, it must, therefore, teach this, that the supreme manifestation of divine character is in self-sacrificing love ; that if men are to seek to be like the highest, they must seek it in the manifestation of self-sacrificing love, and in obtaining that character which prompts to and makes possible such manifestation.

This, therefore, is the professed creed of Christians. Every time a Christian says "I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ," he professes his belief in the supreme goodness of self-sacrificing love. He says, "It is the supreme character of God—it must be mine." Belief in the incarnation involves this. We do not pause now to say a word as to whether the practice of those who call themselves Christians is the legitimate outcome of this belief. It is enough to show that this principle is at the root of Christianity.

(2.) We shall find that this view of the

essential principle of Christianity is still farther strengthened by considering the teachings of Jesus Himself, specially as those teachings were illustrated and enforced by His life. Though we do not need to dwell on the point, it is unquestionably these, the life and teachings of Jesus, which have perpetually convinced men of His divinity. It will be noticed, however, that this view of the matter will apply to those who do not accept what is commonly known as the orthodox view of the Founder of Christianity, yet accept His teachings as binding upon their hearts and consciences, because they believe them to be the representation of the highest ethical development yet attained by humanity. Examination will show that at the heart of the teaching of Jesus lies the same principle which we found to underlie the doctrine of the incarnation.

This is so plain even on a cursory reading of the four gospels, that it would be

superfluous to call attention to the fact, were it not so persistently ignored, not only in practice, but even by Christian teachers.

The teaching of Jesus was very simple. He made no attempt at system. The four writers who have recorded His words seem to have aimed simply to reproduce what He said and did, and the effect produced on those about Him without ever thinking of such a thing as an ethical system. For all that, the relation of all the teaching of Jesus to the great central truth of the nature of God is as plain as that of planet to sun.

When Jesus was asked what was the great commandment of the law, He answered : "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind ; this is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two

commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

From the earliest days of Christianity, even in the days of the apostles,* men have sometimes interpreted these words as though the keeping of the former part of this precept were to take the place of keeping the latter, and while hating their neighbor with right cordial hatred, have solaced themselves with the reflection that they were "lovers of God." The interpretation which Jesus Himself puts on the thought shows that such an attitude is an impossibility. Love of God is impossible without the love of men. For to love God means to love the character of God, and to throw the whole strength of one's nature into the effort to be like Him. But the supreme manifestation of God is self-sacrificing love. Love of God, then, can never be real, however ecstatic, or religious, or mystic,

* See the Epistles of St. John.

which does not realize the supreme goodness of self-sacrificing love ; that is, find the supreme good in life in manifesting self-sacrificing love, and in obtaining the divine likeness which makes it possible.

So at least Jesus interpreted love of God for us This is His word to His followers : " I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven : for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. . . . Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect."

Love of one's neighbor is therefore enjoined by the command to love God. In addition to this, Jesus enjoined it upon His followers as a separate command : "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

This command is looked upon by some as weak, sentimental, likely to lead to unnecessary self-sacrifice, almost unmoral and quite impossible. In reality it is the profoundest word ever uttered. In it is the hope of the world. Jesus here strikes the just balance between the two forces of self-love and altruism, the centripetal and centrifugal forces of society. He does not command love for others which shall cease to do for self.

The individual is still to care for himself, to be his own helper, to look out for number one ; but Jesus commands each one of His followers to have for others the same love, no less and no more, that he has for himself.

It will not be necessary for us to dwell on the illustration and enforcement of these principles given us in the matchless life of Jesus. I am writing now specially for Christian people, to whom the story of that life, with its measureless depths of self-sacrificing love, is perfectly famil-

iar. Such, however, should remind themselves that the highest ambition which every Christian nominally sets himself is to follow Jesus ; that is, to try to be like Him, to catch His spirit and live as He did. Alike from the basis of Christianity, the doctrine of the incarnation, from the teaching of Jesus, and from His life and death we come to the same great ethical truth, that the highest life which man can live is that which is fullest of love and service.

If we turn to the writings of the immediate followers of Jesus, we shall find they understood this as the central truth of the teachings of their Master. Amongst all the virtues, they uniformly give the highest place to love. "And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three, but the greatest of these is love," says St. Paul. To the same great exponent of Christianity we owe the magnificent conception of a thoroughly Christianized society expressed in the figure of the body and

its members. Could the members of society once become full of the spirit back of this figure there could no more be strife between labor and capital than there could be between a man's hand and eye. Not to dwell on the innumerable passages in which St. Paul illustrates and enforces the same thought, or on the testimony of St. James and St. Peter to the preëminence of love, if we look into the writings of St. John we shall find how clearly he held that love was the central thought of his Master's teachings. We take the following representative passages from his First Epistle :

“ This, then, is the message which we have heard from Him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all. . . He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him. But he that hateth his brother

is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes." (I John i. 5; ii. 9, 10, 11.)

"Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother. For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." (I John iii. 1, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18.)

“Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God ; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is love. No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and His love is perfected in us. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar ; for he that loveth not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen ? And this commandment have we from Him, That he who loveth God love his brother also.” (I John, iv. 7, 8, 12, 20, 21.)

What has been already said would seem sufficient to establish our point, but there is another way of looking at Christianity, which in the minds of superficial religionists is often allowed to take the place of this character of manhood and of life, which it seeks to induce, and which it pronounces essential. In reality, however, this aspect of Chris-

tianity brings out the preëminence of self-sacrificing love in the most forcible manner possible. We refer to the doctrine ✓ of salvation through Christ.

I do not desire to characterize here any pious view of this doctrine. I would not attempt to show all that may be meant by the words so often used in the Scriptures, "Believe in Christ, and thou shalt be saved." But looking at the words in an ethical point of view, I wish to emphasize one thing they *must* mean. I must go farther than this, and say that any view of these words which will lose sight of this necessary meaning, or be taken as a substitute for it, seems to me unmoral and against the whole spirit of the teachings of Jesus.

The relation between belief in Jesus Christ and man's salvation is not arbitrary but essential.

Whatever else salvation may mean, it must come at last to mean this—being made like Jesus Christ. It is to be deliv-

ered from sin as He was, from positive sin, which is wrong-doing, and from negative sin, which is failure to be what God would have man be. To be thus delivered from sin, and built up in the likeness of Jesus is salvation. There may be much else embraced in the word, but this is necessary to it.

What is belief in Christ? Whatever else it means, it must mean this: to find in Jesus the manifestation of the highest and holiest, toward which the soul must aspire or be degraded; to feel an inner necessity of making the life like His, or the life will be lost; to know that to catch His Spirit, and gain His character is the supreme good in existence which it is worth any price of struggle or agony to gain. Such belief in Christ as this has in itself the working of man's salvation, that is, man's deliverance from sin, and growth into the likeness of Jesus.

But the symbol which best expresses the work, the life, the character of Jesus,

is the cross, the symbol of self-sacrificing love. To believe in Jesus is to believe in the divineness of self-sacrificing love; to set that before self as the divinely revealed good, to treasure which is to follow Christ, to attain which is salvation.

Thus from whatever point we touch the circumference of Christianity, we come to the same central truth. The revelation of the nature of God, as given to us in the incarnation, the teachings of Christ, the interpretation put upon those teachings by His immediate followers, the great doctrine of salvation through belief in Christ—all mean the same thing: that a selfish life is a wrong, wicked, foolish, lost life ; and that human life is only truly found as it is given in self-sacrificing love. Or, to express it in language less of the pulpit and more of everyday speech, this is of the very spirit of Christianity, that a man should think, speak, act and live for the interests of

others, just as much as for his own interest.

This is the theory of Christians. How of their practice? How about business? What shall we say of our present industrial system?

It would be time wasted to show that, with some rare exceptions, men do not as yet manage their business on these principles, no matter how devoted adherents of Christianity they may be. It is tacitly understood among them as impossible, and they never think of attempting it. "The Sermon on the Mount will do well enough on Sundays, but it has nothing whatever to do with business. Buy in the lowest market, sell in the highest, that is business. Labor is a commodity, bought and sold as anything else. When a man buys it, he buys it in the lowest market; when a man sells it, he sells it in the highest. The buyer looks out for his interest, and the seller for his. If the buyer of labor gets a good

bargain, so much the better for him. Be fair, be honest, keep back nothing ; men have learned the necessity of that ; but don't expect us to do anything more than that. Don't expect us to give any higher wages than we are absolutely compelled to pay. Don't expect us to manage our business for the profit of our employés or of the public. Don't expect us, in buying, or selling, or manufacturing, to think of any one's interests but our own. Yes, sir, I believe in Christianity. Here is a thousand dollars for the chapel. Here is a hundred dollars to distribute among the destitute. How large a check shall I draw for Christian education ? What ought I to give for missionary work in Africa ? I believe in practical Christianity, and mean to show my faith by my works. But religion is one thing and business another. Christianity has nothing to do with the rate of wages. I recognize the stewardship of wealth, and try to spend my income as a Christian should,

in the way it will do the most good ; but to bid me apply Christianity to money *making*, to buy and sell labor, or anything else, with a desire to promote the interests of others as well as my own, is sentimental rubbish. It is perfectly just and fair for me to get all the rent for this tenement house I can, and to be content with one penny less would not be business. It is perfectly just and fair for me to take my thousands every year out of this colliery, and give the miners the wages contracted for ; are they not the market wages ? For me to give one penny above the market wages, no matter how low, would be a business absurdity. Would it impoverish me ? No. Would it bring my production to a standstill ? No. Would it wrong a single other man, employer or employed ? No ; but it would be in violation of all established business principles, which recognize as the only motives entitled to have any influence in producing wealth, love

of self, desire to promote one's own interests."

I am convinced that if they were asked as to the application of Christian principles to their business, a large majority of the representative men in our churches, the deacons, the wardens, the vestrymen, the class leaders, would make some such reply as the above. Among the remainder would be found very many whose position is somewhat different from this, yet substantially the same. They acknowledge the incongruity of their conduct, but justify themselves with the claim that anything else is impossible. "What am I to do? I am only one of millions of men who are moving in a certain direction. For me to attempt to face about and go where conscience tells me I should go, means only that I shall be either swept off my feet and carried with the crowd, or crushed, cast down to the ground and trodden under foot. I am doing business under a system, and the

system is too strong for me. I am as powerless against this system as a slave-owner whose conscience told him slavery was wrong, used to be at the South before the war. If he sold his slaves, he only turned them over to different masters. If he set them free, he not only impoverished himself, but practically turned them loose to starve. What could such a master do with the slave system against him? And I am just as powerless. I am often tempted to curse my wealth as I think of the system through which it has been made possible. The system says, 'Get as much as you can for as little as you can. Get as many hours' work, and as much work each hour from every man, woman and child in your employ, as they will consent to give and the law will allow; and give in return the smallest wage for which they will consent to work. If the sharp bite of cold and the crack of hunger's whip drive them to work for a pittance, be thankful and take

the goods the gods provide. Then go to work and take the same pains to sell your wares high that you have taken to buy your labor cheap. Compete or combine, lower your prices to drive that competitor out of your way, or combine with him to raise your prices. But in buying labor, or selling goods, buy, sell, work, plan, think only for yourself.' This is what the system expects of me. This is what others are doing and will do. It is absolutely impossible to love one's neighbor as one's self in actual business dealings with him, under a system whose Alpha and Omega is 'thou shalt love thyself with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.'

Thus, then, the matter stands. On one side we see the spirit and letter of Christianity which says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and which sets before men as the highest type of character self-sacrificing love; on the other, the all but universal practice of represen-

tative Christians which sets aside these principles in business as inapplicable or impracticable, and recognizes only self-interest. On one side we see men professing with the most undoubted sincerity, their profound belief in and loyal adherence to the sublimest ethical system the world has ever seen (which carried out would regenerate the world), and on the other conducting their business with no more regard to the fundamental teachings of this system than if it had never existed, using men as so many machines to increase their own wealth, without the slightest recognition of any community of interest with them, or of the fact that every precept of their religion bids them work as hard, as patiently, as intelligently for the wealth of others as for their own wealth. Moreover, we see this absurdity hardened into a system which holds all men—Christians and non-Christians, employers and employed—alike in its grip. Escape seems to them impossible. Their better

nature revolts against it. They realize the evil and injustice that it causes. They know it is unworthy of them as men and as Christians. But there is the dead weight of an unrighteous system holding them down with a force against which they are practically powerless.

How much longer will this gross and palpable absurdity continue ?

This is a very grave question for Christians and particularly teachers of Christianity to face. It presents itself in a very forcible manner to every clergyman in the falling away from the institutions of Christianity of the great mass of our workingmen. Why is it ? Other causes have much to do with it; but the root of the trouble is that workingmen see a most unhallowed contrast between the theory of Christians, which means regard for the interest of others, and the business practice of Christians, which means every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost. As a workingman recently

expressed it: "Our Christian employers pray for us on Sunday and prey on us all the rest of the week." That immense sums are given in charity, that philanthropy is fashionable, that visiting the poor and relieving those in distress is recognized as only the plain duty of men, that sympathetic hearts are touched and loving hands extended to help wherever there is misery, however caused, does not touch the root of the matter. The principle on which business is conducted tends to result in this, that the man makes paupers for his wife and daughters to practice philanthropy on. It is this inconsistency which often makes workingmen, without waiting to ask themselves whether they are distinguishing between what is essential to Christianity and what is a false representation of it, loathe the very sight of a church. There is more, too, than this inconsistency, monstrous as it is, to give occasion for this feeling. The Church is naturally conservative. She tries to keep

things as they are, at least to avoid any radical change. She tells men of a time when all things will be righted, and fastening her eyes on the world to come she overlooks the glaring injustice that is done under the very shadow of her sanctuary. But workingmen find it hard to believe that the principles of the Kingdom of Heaven will make men just or loving hereafter, if they do not make them just and loving now. What influence over any, except the favored few, can the Church hope to have when her members conduct their business on principles which are certainly very different from those the Founder of the Church enjoined, and the Church herself frowns down any attempt on a large scale to make things better?

But to a thoughtful mind the question assumes a more serious aspect than the threatened revolt of the working classes from the institutions of Christianity.

The most dangerous scepticism is not

that which questions the institutions of Christianity, but that which shall question the spirit which lies back of Christianity itself.

Hitherto there has been very little of anything approaching this. Theoretically, men still believe in the teachings of Christ. Theoretically, our pulpits ring with dissertations on the supreme goodness of self-sacrificing love, and the pews vie with the pulpit in proclaiming belief in Jesus Christ as the only hope of salvation for the individual and the world. But how long will this continue in view of the absurd contrast between Christian theory and Christian practice ?

I do not claim that this contrast is any greater now than it has been at any other time since the advent of Christianity. On the contrary, I most firmly believe that it is less. The strongest weapon in the hands of the opponents of Christianity is that, through all her history, the Church, while proclaiming the principles

of the Kingdom of Heaven, has overlooked or winked at, and sometimes herself made use of practices dictated by the principles of the Kingdom of Hell. They have, however, failed to see that the contrast between Christian theory and Christian practice has been continually narrowing. It is less to-day than it has ever been.

Less, but more absurd. At least its absurdity is more apparent to people generally. And because of this, it is less tolerable to society, less likely to continue, more likely to become, as every absurdity eventually must become, an impossibility. A few years ago it used to be thought little objection to a thing that it was absurd. It was rather an argument in its favor than otherwise. But it is so no longer. Says Matthew Arnold : * "Twenty years and more have now gone by since in a lecture at Oxford I quoted the declaration of a member of

* "Nineteenth Century" for January, 1887.

Parliament, a friend of mine, that a thing's being an anomaly was, in his opinion, no objection to it whatever, and I remarked that, at any rate, perhaps the labors of the friends of light might be trusted to prevail so far as this ; that in twenty years' time it should be thought, even in England, an objection to a thing that it is absurd. And this is really what has come about. Things are no longer looked upon as a part of the order of creation, merely because we find them existing. If they are absurd, this is now a positive objection to them; they become impossible as well, and have to be got rid of."

Who can doubt that the "labors of the friends of light," and above all of Him whose name is Light and Love, that for all the ages has been working to bring men to love the light and live in it, may be counted on to render an impossibility the palpable absurdity of the contrast between Christian theory and Christian practice ?

But meanwhile that contrast is driving thoughtful men everywhere into scepticism of the one utterly hopeless kind. If the precepts of Christ will not work in business that makes up so large a part of life, will they work at all? If I find it impossible to love my neighbor as myself in my business relations with him, why should I pretend to love him at all? If self-sacrificing love, which is at the heart of Christianity, is a failure, why should I believe in Christianity or in Christ? It would be difficult to over-estimate the bad effects of such questions as these, and that they are very real questions which thoughtful people are everywhere asking themselves is beyond all doubt. Such questions sap the missionary life of the Church, and the moment Christianity ceases to be a missionary religion, it is smitten with paralysis. But we are coming to see that the peculiar claims of Christianity among the religions of the world will not stand vindicated simply

by an appeal to the lives of individual men and women who have grown up into heroism and holiness under its influence. The Spirit of the Holy One has influenced men through other religions and made them heroes, saints, martyrs and prophets, just as it has through Christianity. The devout and intelligent follower of Gautama, of Confucius, or of Mahomet will not be moved to accept the claims of Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of the world, with a law and a gospel for all nations of men, by anything short of a manifest and peculiar salvation of society in Christian lands, wrought by the acceptance of that law and gospel as practical motives for conduct among Christian people. And, worse than this, such questions drive men back upon lower principles of action. The highest principles will not work, therefore we must be satisfied with the lower. But why not with still lower, when the process of evolution has been once reversed. For it is the

vision of something yet higher and better which leads men on step by step to higher and better things ; and if men once come to believe that this moral and spiritual progress is a failure, because the highest in morals to which it has yet brought us is a failure, it is absolutely certain that degradation will take the place of evolution ; we shall return to the unrestricted struggle for existence where the strongest and most cunning are to win ; with this difference, that we shall be stronger and more cunning for mutual destruction.

I do not believe that any good and sufficient answer can be given to this utterly radical scepticism, save the answer of Christian Socialism. Before giving this, which may be called the "message of Christian Socialism," a word of explanation is necessary. In what has been said in the preceding pages as to the essential thought of Christianity, I would not be understood as meaning that this

is all there is in Christianity. Very far from it. Indeed I am convinced that this great truth of the necessity of obedience to the law of love is rather a corollary of another great truth still more essential to Christianity, viz., that man is the child of God. I have not spoken of this, because it was not the place to speak of it. Christian Socialism, however, must not be thought of as ignoring it or losing sight of it for an instant. It is this great truth that lies back of the thought of the sacredness of the individual which Christian Socialism would hold to with as much tenacity as the advocates of the most extreme individualism. It is because man is the child of God, made in God's image, that the life and development of the individual become sacred. A Socialism which neglected this would certainly be most unchristian Socialism. To be truly Christian, Socialism must build upon the high, divine and eternal nature of man as the child of God ; and

the danger lest this thought should be lost sight of by Socialists is one reason for the existence of Christian Socialism. But the crying need of the day is the reassertion of the great ethical principles of Christianity as applicable to our social and economic life, and it is these which Christian Socialism specially emphasizes.

CHAPTER VII.

THE MESSAGE OF CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM.

I TAKE the message of Christian Socialism to be about this :

(1.) It asserts that there is a social side of man's life which is just as deserving of consideration as his life as an individual. If man is the child of God by the divine power and will, he is also a brother in the great human family by the divine power and will. God that has made him an individual has also made him a member of society. God's law, therefore, must be just as binding upon him in his social relations, as it is in his personal relations to God.

(2.) Christian Socialism asserts that this law of God for man has been once

for all made known to man. As man is an individual, with the sacred individuality of a child of God, the law of the Heavenly Father is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." And as man is a member of society, with relations to his brother men, God's law for him is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

(3.) Christian Socialism asserts that just as the law of God for the individual is not only practicable and possible, but in the highest degree productive of good for the individual, so God's law for man as a member of society is not only practicable and possible, but in the highest degree productive of good to the individual man as a member of society, and to society, of which he is a member.

(4.) Christian Socialism asserts that the law of God for men as members of society, is not only His law for them as members of society, but God's law for

society. As men become conscious of this social life, as municipalities, states, nations, society, they are called upon of God to give conscious obedience to this law, and to found their institutions, their politics, and their economies upon it. This means, when applied to economics, that conscious coöperation for the common good shall take the place of competition for private gain. It is true that society cannot compel men to care for their neighbors' interests as for their own. It is true, also, that under any system, founded on whatsoever principles, the selfishness of the selfish and the sin of the sinful will show itself. It yet remains that society is bound by the law of God, and the carrying out of this law by society in economics requires a system of production and distribution which shall start from organized society as a body, and consciously seek to benefit society equitably in every one of its members.

(5.) Christian Socialism asserts, that

not only is our present industrial system not founded upon the social law of God, but that in its present advanced state, on the one hand it tends to bring into individual members of society, in their dealings with each other, principles and motives which are in direct violation of this law of God, and, on the other, necessarily produces results which are incompatible with it. For by private ownership of land and capital a large part of the community are systematically robbed of a portion of the advantages which belong to them as members of society, which is plainly not loving our neighbors as ourselves. Christian Socialism would, therefore, seek to bring about a system of production and distribution which should be founded on the principle of general coöperation for the general good, and in which there should be, along with inviolable sacredness of property and the utmost freedom of consumption, collective ownership and control of land and capital

as indispensable to effective production and equitable distribution.

(6.) Christian Socialism asserts that, however desirable in itself such a system may be, as the carrying out of the law of God into the life of society, and as embodying the most effective principles of economics, it must be brought about by just and righteous means. Christian Socialism will have nothing to do with robbing robbers, or expropriating expropriators. It has too much faith in itself to believe that it needs, or can be anything else than thwarted by fire, sword, or force. It comes with a law and a gospel for men. Its law is love ; its gospel is hope. It has faith enough in human nature to believe that as the eternal rightness of its law shall unfold itself to man's moral nature, and the economic advantages it holds out make men feel its gospel of hope, society will need no further persuasion.

In giving the above as what I take to

be the message of Christian Socialism, it will be understood, of course, that I speak simply as an individual Christian Socialist. I venture to give also the Declaration of Principles adopted by the Society of Christian Socialists, recently formed in Boston, and also the Declaration of Principles of the First Nationalist Club of Boston, both of which will help to an intelligent appreciation of Christian Socialism. To those who have not followed the remarkable strides made by Nationalism, it will not be out of place to say that Nationalism is, as will be seen by comparing the Declarations of Principles, a specific form of Socialism, which assumes the Nation as the form of society in and through which Socialism is to be realized. Instead of saying, for example, that all industries are to be operated by society, and in the interest of society, it says (see Declaration of Principles) "We merely seek to push this principle [of association] a little farther, and have all

industries operated in the interest of all by the Nation—the people organized—the organic unity of the whole people.”

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN SOCIALISTS.

To exalt the principle that all rights and powers are gifts of God, not for the receiver's use only, but for the benefit of all ; to magnify the oneness of the human family, and to lift mankind to the highest plane of privilege, we band ourselves together under the name of Christian Socialists.

I. We hold that God is the source and guide of all human progress, and we believe that all social, political and industrial relations should be based on the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, in the spirit and according to the teachings of Jesus Christ.

II. We hold that the present commercial and industrial system is not thus based, but rests rather on economic individualism, the results of which are :

(1) That the natural resources of the earth and the mechanical inventions of man are made to accrue disproportionately to the advantage of the few instead of the many.

(2) That production is without general plan, and commercial and industrial crises are thereby precipitated.

(3) That the control of business is rapidly concentrating in the hands of a dangerous plutocracy, and the destinies of the masses of wage-earners are becoming increasingly dependent on the will and resources of a narrowing number of wage-payers.

(4) That thus large occasion is given for the moral evils of mammonism, recklessness, overcrowding, intemperance, prostitution, crime.

III. We hold that united Christianity must protest against a system so based, and productive of such results, and must demand a reconstructed social order which, adopting some method of production and distribution that starts from organized society as a body and seeks to benefit society equitably in every one of its members, shall be based on the Christian principle that "We are members one of another."

IV. While recognizing the present dangerous tendency of business towards combinations and trusts, we yet believe that the economic circumstances which call them into being, will necessarily result in the development of such a social order, which, with the equally necessary development of individual character, will be at once true Socialism and true Christianity.

V. Our objects, therefore, as Christian Socialists, are.

(1) To show that the aim of Socialism is embraced in the aim of Christianity.

(2) To awaken members of Christian churches to the fact that the teachings of Jesus Christ lead directly to some specific form or forms of Socialism ; that therefore the church has a definite duty upon this matter and must, in simple obedience to Christ, apply itself to the realization of the Social principles of Christianity.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES OF THE NATIONALIST CLUB OF BOSTON.

The principle of the Brotherhood of Humanity is one of the eternal truths that govern the world's progress on lines which distinguish human nature from brute nature.

The principle of competition is simply the application of the brutal law of the survival of the strongest and most cunning.

Therefore, so long as competition continues to be the ruling factor in our industrial system, the highest development of the individual cannot be reached, the loftiest aims of humanity cannot be realized.

No truth can avail unless practically applied. Therefore those who seek the welfare of man must endeavor to suppress the system founded on the brute principle of competition and put in its place another based on the nobler principle of association.

But in striving to apply this nobler and wiser principle to the complex conditions of modern life, we advocate no sudden or ill considered changes ; we make no war upon individuals ; we do not censure those who have accumulated immense fortunes simply by carrying to a logical end the false principle on which business is now based.

The combinations, trusts and syndicates of which the people at present complain demonstrate the practicability of our basic principle of association. We merely seek to push this principle a little further and have all industries operated in the interest of all by the nation—the people organized—the organic unity of the whole people.

The present industrial system proves itself wrong by the immense wrongs it produces : it proves itself absurd by the immense waste of energy and material which is admitted to be its concomitant. Against this system we raise our protest : for the abolition of the slavery it has wrought and would perpetuate, we pledge our best efforts.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REALIZATION OF CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM.

WE have come now to the last branch of our inquiry, viz.,

IV. How can the great social and economic changes involved in Socialism be brought about by just and orderly methods?

Of course there are many to whom this question will seem unimportant, inasmuch as they have no sort of faith in Socialism, and no desire for the changes it would introduce. I think, however, that the number of these is relatively much smaller than one would suppose. The proportion of the population who are discontented with the present outlook in

social and economic matters, and who believe that there is something radically wrong in our industrial system, is certainly very large, and grows every day larger. Of course they do not all believe, in fact it must be admitted that at present, at least, only a very few of them believe that the remedy is to be sought in Socialism. Many are afraid of the word, and very few have anything like an intelligent appreciation of what is meant by it. But it is certainly a suggestive fact that a book devoted to the setting forth of thoroughgoing Socialism should have attained a circulation in little more than two years of more than four hundred thousand, as is the case with Mr. Bellamy's "Looking Backward." And it is a still more significant fact that a book which advocates Socialism so far as the land is concerned, which is precisely what Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" does, should have attained the popularity and exerted the influence, both at home and abroad,

which this remarkable book has done. In truth there are multitudes of people who are looking toward Socialism, and desiring the changes it would introduce, who will have nothing to do with the name. Others will go part way. They believe in collective control of what they call natural monopolies, and would put the railroads, telegraph, express business, and transportation, as well as the post-office, under national control, (which would be so far forth Socialism), and other things, such as furnishing gas and electricity, and the street railroads, under municipal control, which would again be so far forth Socialism, however advocates of such measures may dislike the name. It is difficult to see why those who advocate collective ownership and control of these natural monopolies, as they are pleased to call them, will not further extend their scheme to the great natural monopoly, the ownership of the land; but we do not here criticise the position, but merely

state it. To all of these, and also to that growing number who say of Nationalism or Socialism, "this is glorious if it could only be brought about," the question becomes of great interest and importance: "How can these changes involved in Socialism be brought about. Above all, for it is the crux of the difficulty, how can land and capital be made to pass from private ownership and control to collective ownership and control without robbery either out and out or thinly disguised under some more euphonious name?"

At the beginning of this inquiry, it is important to note how far Socialism has already advanced, and what rapid progress it is making. I cannot do better than make the following extended quotation from Prof. Webb's "Socialism in England," to show how things are moving in England towards Socialism. Perhaps our own advance may not be quite so rapid. Humiliating as it must be to an American to confess it, the

mother country is undoubtedly ahead of us in many particulars of industrial development; and as Socialism becomes possible and necessary only in advanced industrial development, her more rapid progress in this direction is but natural.

Prof. Webb says: *

“Besides our international relations, and the army, navy, police and the courts of justice, the community now carries on for itself, in some part or another of these islands, the post-office, telegraphs, carriage of small commodities, coinage surveys, the regulation of the currency and note issue, the provision of weights and measures, the making, sweeping, lighting and repairing of the streets, roads and bridges, life-insurance, the grant of annuities, ship-building, stock-broking, banking, farming and money-lending. It provides for many thousands of us from birth to burial, midwifery, nursery, education, board and lodging, vaccination, med-

* Page 61 *et seq.*

ical attendance, medicine, public worship, amusement and burial. It furnishes and maintains its own museums, parks, botanic gardens, art galleries, libraries, concert halls, roads, streets, bridges, markets, fire-engines, light-houses, pilots, ferries, surf-boats, steam-tugs, life-boats, slaughter-houses, cemeteries, harbors, public baths, wash-houses, pounds, piers, wharfs, hospitals, dispensaries, gas-works, water-works, tramways, telegraph cables, allotments, cow-meadows, artisans' dwellings, common lodging houses, schools, churches and reading-rooms. It carries on and publishes its own researches in geology, meteorology, statistics, zoology, geography, and even theology. In our colonies the English government further allows and encourages the communities to provide for themselves railways, canals, pawnbroking, theatres, forestry, cinchona farms, irrigation, leper villages, casinos, bathing establishments, and immigration; and to

deal in ballast, guano, quinine, opium, salt and what not. Every one of these functions, including even the army, navy, police and courts of justice, was at one time left to private enterprise and was a source of legitimate individual investment of capital. Step by step the community has absorbed them wholly or partially, and the area of private exploitation has been lessened. Parallel with this progressive nationalization or municipalization of industry, there has gone on, outside, the elimination of the purely personal element in business management. The older economists doubted whether anything but banking and insurance could be carried on by joint stock enterprise; now every conceivable industry, down to baking and milk-selling, is successfully managed by the salaried officers of large corporations of idle shareholders. More than one-third of the whole business of England, measured by the capital employed, is now done by joint stock companies.

“ Besides all its direct suppression of private enterprise, the State now registers, inspects and controls nearly all the industrial functions which it has not yet absorbed. In addition to births marriages, deaths, and electors, the State registers all solicitors,” etc. [The list given is too long for insertion.]

“ Nor is the registration a mere form. Most of the foregoing are also inspected and criticised, as well as all railways, tramways, ships, mines, factories, canal-boats, public conveyances, fisheries, slaughter-houses, dairies, milk shops, bakeries, baby farms, gas meters, schools of anatomy, vivisection laboratories, explosive works, Scotch herrings, and common lodging-houses.

“ The inspection is often detailed and exhaustive. It may be said, moreover, once for all, that laws of this kind are much more rigidly enforced and generally obeyed in England than in the United States. The State, in most of the large

industrial operations, prescribes the age of the worker, the hours of work, the amount of air, light, cubic space, heat, lavatory accommodation, holiday and meal times ; when, where and how wages shall be paid ; how machinery, staircases, lift-holes, mines and quarries are to be fenced and guarded ; how and when the plant shall be cleaned, repaired, and worked. Even the kind of package in which some articles shall be sold is duly prescribed, so that the individual capitalist shall take no advantage of his position. On every side he is being registered, inspected, controlled, and eventually superseded by the community, and is compelled, in the meantime, to cede for public purposes an ever-increasing share of his rent and interest.

“ It will be objected by many persons that this is not what they understand by Socialism. There are doubtless still some who might be compelled to admit that they imagined that Socialists wanted to

bring about a sanguinary conflict in the streets, and then the next day to compel all delicately nurtured people to work, at a fixed rate of wage, in the government factories. This, however, is merely part of the obstinate survival of the 'Utopian' conception of Socialism, already referred to. Whether we so describe them or not, these features of modern English society are essentially 'collectivist' in character, and are utterly contrary to the individualist principles lately dominant in thought. Mr. Herbert Spencer quite properly regards the whole course of legislation, during the present generation, as subversive of that unrestrained individual liberty which forms his ideal of social order. He also foretells its inevitable issue. 'The numerous socialistic changes made by Act of Parliament, joined with numerous others presently to be made, will by-and-by be all merged in State Socialism—swallowed in the vast wave, which they have little by little raised.' 'It is

indeed certain,' the political economists now agree, 'that industrial society will not permanently remain without a systematic organization. The mere conflict of private interests will never produce a well-ordered commonwealth of labor.'"

I have made this extended quotation not simply because it shows how far Socialism has already advanced, and how rapidly it is advancing, but because it illustrates the Socializing process. Here are no sudden and violent changes, but here is a definite process going on all along the line, the whole tendency of which is unmistakably toward Socialism ; or rather, in a broad sense of the term, the process itself is Socialism. It is the thought of an organism, society, conscious of its existence, and using its intelligence and its conscience for its own good. It is the growing recognition of the solidarity of humanity. It is the corporate life and welfare being more and more set over against the individ-

ual's conception of what his own interests alone might lead him to do. This is already Socialism. The process, however, will not stop till it has reached what we have termed specific Socialism, namely, collective ownership and control of land and capital.

Of course it would be the utmost presumption for any one to say through just what stages society will move toward that goal. Why should any one even wish to make the rash attempt, when it is plain that society is moving in that direction almost as rapidly as the most ardent Socialist could desire? In what I shall have to say, therefore, in answer to the question before us, I do not desire to play the rôle of a prophet. I desire simply to call the attention of any who may be interested enough in the inquiry to care for its solution, to certain facts, laws, principles or tendencies (it matters not by which name they are called) which we may reasonably infer are likely to play

a very important part in the gradual development of Socialism.

(1.) The great changes which Socialism aims to introduce must vindicate their right to be in healthy, wholesome struggle for existence, in which that survives which shows itself fittest to survive.

It would be folly to imagine that we could point to any time in the future and say : "In such and such a year of grace individualism will be done away, and Socialism take its place." For no one can say how long a time competition and coöperation will exist side by side. There will be individual ownership and control of capital in many lines of production, even after there shall be very general collective production with collective control of the capital employed. Indeed it is not necessary to the scheme of Socialism that all capital shall eventually be collectively owned and controlled. Socialism aims at the good of society, and if some lines of production can be

more equitably and efficiently carried on by individual ownership and management, then intelligent Socialism would certainly relegate such lines of production to the ownership and control of individuals. Intelligent Socialism aims at collective production because it believes that only so can production be most equitably and efficiently carried on. But it would seek to introduce collective production only so far and so fast as it shows itself both equitable and efficient; and even under general collective production, there might remain a field for individualist production, not simply where it would have obvious advantages, but also as furnishing a basis of comparison, and perhaps a needful stimulus to those engaged in collective production.

In other words, it is by the manifest positive advantages of Socialism that Socialism will prevail. Socialism is a new type of production, developed under our modern industrial conditions. It has

made its appearance, and enters into a struggle for existence with the old type. This implies that for a time at least they shall coexist. If Socialism is best fitted as the type of production, it has nothing to fear in the struggle, but is sure to survive. If not, it is not only destined to perish, but it is good for humanity that it should perish.

In saying this I do not wish to be understood that Socialists accept as their criterion of the best method of production that contemptible standard of cheapness which some political economists are forever extolling. Kingsley has epitomized it in four words, "Cheap clothes, and nasty." Cheapness of commodity, when it is bought at the price of cheapened manhood, starvation, cold and nakedness on the part of those who are engaged in that particular line of production, simply means the enslaving of a portion of the community to multiply goods for another part of the community.

Economy of production is one part of the problem, and a great part, which Socialism meets just as squarely as any other part of the problem. Nay, it is just on this ground that it is challenging individualism in production. But when one sees the flaunted and often grotesque luxury of the over-rich contrasted with the slender portion of the average worker, one cannot help feeling that the part of the economic problem which most imperatively demands solution is not economy of production but equity of distribution. Let it be noted, however, that in speaking of Socialism vindicating its right to be by practically demonstrating its obvious advantages, I mean its advantages to society in all respects, on every plane where the interests of society can be touched, whether economic, moral, or social, and giving each plane its due comparative importance.

This gradual method of the introduction of Socialism by winning its own way

is of such importance that I shall venture to illustrate it in one or two lines of production. The first is the case of what is commonly called a natural monopoly in which in England the principle of collective ownership and control has already gained a considerable portion of the field of production,—namely, the manufacture and distribution of gas. In almost every city of England the manufacture of gas is under municipal or state control so far that its quality and price are regulated by law. A majority of the cities manufacture their own gas, own their own plant, and discharge every function of a producer and distributor of gas. And this has come about in a perfectly natural and healthy way. In those cities where collective production has been tried, its advantages over the former system of production have been such as to justify the change, and induce other cities to make the change. It is simply a case of the survival of the fittest.

We have every reason to think that any other line of industry would pass from individual to collective control in the same gradual method. Let us suppose, for example, that a belief in the advantages of collective production had gained such hold of the mind of the community that there should be a demand for its application to the manufacture of cotton goods. This would not mean that the manufacture of cotton goods by individual manufacturers would be at once forbidden, so that the community might have a monopoly of the cotton industry, and make cotton goods in such quantities and of such qualities, and sell them at such prices, and pay all those engaged in this industry such wages as the overseers appointed by the community to superintend this line of production should see fit. Still less would it mean that the community would take forcible possession of the capital belonging to those already engaged in the cotton industry and use it

for its own production. The natural and healthy method would seem to be that the community should undertake to produce cotton goods, having the good of the community and of every member of the community in view in every stage of production,—in the conditions under which the men and women employed did their work, in the hours of labor required, in the wages paid, in the quality of goods made and in the price demanded for them. For a time side by side with this collective production individualist production would go on, where the motive was solely and entirely to make profits for those who had invested their money in the manufacture of cotton goods,—where men, women and children would be hired for the lowest pittance for which they could be induced to work, and for as many hours; and where the quality of goods made and the prices asked for them would all be determined by the question of profits for the capital em-

ployed. These two methods of production struggle for possession of the field, and that method will eventually prevail which shall show itself, all things considered, to have the greater advantages. But let no one think that it will be simply a question of a fraction of a cent more or less in the price of cotton per yard. It will be that, and a great deal more than that.

(2.) This brings us to what many consider the real crux of the problem: "Supposing that the advantages of collective production are obvious, how can the requisite capital be brought within collective ownership and control?"

I desire once more to emphasize here, because it is essential to any thing like an intelligent apprehension of the whole discussion, what has been already said as to the position of Socialism with reference to wealth and property. Socialism has no contention with wealth, but seeks to increase and diffuse wealth. So far

from impairing the sacredness of property, it seeks to enhance the sacredness of property. Its contention is not with wealth or property, but with the sting which wealth acquires when it is transformed into capital in the hands of individuals. Believing, therefore, in the sacredness of property, Socialism would leave the millionaire his millions, but would seek to take away their sting; their power, that is, to get him other millions. Socialism might condone all past spoliation, but will see that there is no spoliation in the future.

To take the United States for example, we must remember that the present wealth of the nation is very small compared with what it will be even a few decades hence. Socialism looks toward this future. When the fundamental positions of Socialism take possession of the public mind and conscience so that the community recognizes these two thoughts at least, viz., (1.) That in a civilized com-

munity there are overwhelming moral, social and economic advantages in collective production; and (2.), That in a community where industrial development has reached an advanced stage, individualist production with the concomitants of private ownership and control of land and capital, results in despoiling the community as a whole, and specially a large part of the community, of the advantages which belong to them ;—when these two truths shall have gained general recognition, a large portion of the wealth which now comes to individuals to be changed into capital and make ever-increasing gains for themselves, will come to the community to be used as capital by the community for the good of each and all.

For example. All the cities have not yet been founded which this nation is to have. There are thousands of cities yet to be built, which will need what our present cities need. Suppose that these cities in their infancy have not the capi-

tal necessary for furnishing themselves with street railroads, plants for furnishing gas, electricity, water, heat, etc., let these two truths of which I have spoken be fixed in the minds of the community, and the capital will come into their possession naturally enough. If a horse-car company, by consolidating all the lines of the city till it has a monopoly of the business, can guarantee its stockholders eight per cent on all the stock, milk and water alike, put into it, the franchise of the company must be worth something. Such franchise could be granted in a new city, as is sometimes done in Germany, with the stipulation that after a certain number of years, not only the franchise but the whole plant should revert to the community. So of gas, electricity, water, etc. So too of railroads. We have not yet waked up to this problem of transportation and all the issues involved. But when the legislatures of more than one state in the Union

are more than suspected of being controlled by railroad corporations, it is about time we should see that the question is something more than the cost of carrying a barrel of flour from Minneapolis to the sea-board, or how small a piece of coal will move a ton of corn a mile. Let the two truths of which I have spoken take possession of the public mind so that there shall be a general demand for the ownership and control of our railroads by the nation, and even supposing that the nation did not have the capital to invest in building a new railroad that might be needed, it might leave the initiative in building it to individual capitalists, with the stipulation that after a certain term of years it should revert to the nation. Let the community once recognize the fundamental truths on which Socialism rests and the transition from private production to collective production, with the change in the ownership and control of capital, will work itself

out naturally—in a gradual, orderly manner, which will neither rob robbers nor expropriate expropriators.

There are, however, two things which will help on this process when once begun, that are too important to be overlooked.

(1.) Many economic thinkers have set themselves to the task of getting rid of interest. "How can we get rid of interest, rent and profit, so that the entire product of his labor shall go to the laborer?" is the way in which the economic problem presents itself to them.

It does not require much study of the matter, I think, to see that if interest ever dies it must die a natural death. You cannot kill it off-hand. Legislation will not annihilate it any more than it would make specie circulate when a dollar in gold was worth two dollars in currency. Nor can you destroy it altogether by calling interest usury, and appealing to the moral judgment or religious prejudices

of the individual. Nevertheless, it is an economic absurdity to say that interest is necessary, or that the time will not come when the taking of interest will be done away.

Without attempting to be too precise or use technical terms, that which makes interest possible is the possibility of profits. The borrower gives interest for the use of money because the use of it is of advantage to him. The lender demands interest because if he uses his money himself, puts it into land or instruments of production, he will be able to make profit by it.

Take away from the man of wealth the opportunity of investing his wealth profitably in production, by the community becoming the all but universal producer, and the possibility of interest, except in the residuum of individual transactions, which would be of comparatively small importance, is done away. It has died a natural death.

In the transition from individual to collective production, and the passage of capital from individual to collective ownership and control, it is probable that for a considerable time the community would be obliged to pay interest for a large part of the capital it acquired. Nor is it necessary to suppose, as Prof. Shaeffle has done, that the wealth acquired from individuals in the community should be paid back to them in annual instalments in the shape of commodities, and not in money. Both interest and principal might be paid in money without the least violation of true Socialistic principles. But the fundamental truths of Socialism once recognized, the rate of interest which the community would have to pay for the capital it needed would be rapidly diminished by the Socializing process itself, till eventually it would cease.

To illustrate this point. A great city like Boston or New York has now no trouble whatever in borrowing money at

as low a rate as three and a half per cent. Suppose such a city to borrow the amount necessary to pay to its stockholders every cent which the railroad system (horse, electrical or elevated) of the city was entitled to receive for the property. As this debt is paid off year by year, and the holders of the city's bonds come to re-invest their money, it is evident that there is one less channel of profitable investment open to them. They are debarred from investment in this natural monopoly because the city controls it. If the city now goes on to acquire by honest purchase the gas plant of the city, this fact will naturally and inevitably tend to lower the rate of interest which the city will have to pay on the money borrowed to make such purchase. Thus another channel of profitable investment will be taken from individual capitalists and the rate of interest for future borrowing still farther lowered. And if, together with this assumption by the municipality of

functions which would most properly belong to the municipality, there should take place by the nation an assumption of the control of those things which come most properly under the control of the nation, as railroads, telegraph and telephone systems, transportation, etc., it is evident that by the accompanying narrowing of the field of profitable investment to individuals, capital would be more and more drawn into collective control, the rate of interest paid for its use would be rapidly lowered, and capital come with constantly increasing facility to be collectively owned.

All this of course would be possible only as belief in the advantages of collective production should gradually take possession of the public mind and conscience, founded upon no Utopian schemes, but upon sound economic and moral principles, and justified step by step by experience.

(2.) But this gradual method of acquir-

ing capital will be still farther facilitated by a judicious use of the power of taxation inherent in the community.

“Ah! now the bomb is to explode! Now we are to have the spoliation which Socialism always comes to sooner or later, disguised this time under the plausible name of taxation!”

Not a bit of it. There is no bomb to explode, and no spoliation, or expropriation, or anything of the sort.

Remember that we have assumed that the mind of the community has become possessed of the fundamental truths of Socialism, viz., (1.) That there are overwhelming advantages in collective production; (2.) That in an advanced industrial development the ownership and control of large masses of capital enables individuals to appropriate wealth which should go to the whole community.

The general admission of these facts, and particularly of the latter, would mean that if in the transition stage from capi-

talism to Socialism, individuals are still allowed to use for their own profit such intangible public wealth as steam, electricity, wonder-working mechanism, etc., while the community would leave them in undisputed possession of every cent of their property, it would see to it that such individuals paid to the community in the shape of taxes an amount proportionate to what they made out of the community. This can easily be done by a graded income tax. It robs no one. It expropriates no one. It does not make the poor pay half as much again for the necessities of life that somebody may make a profit. It simply says that a man shall give back to the community in proportion to what he gets out of the community. Without attempting the rôle of a prophet here or elsewhere, one can easily see that such a method of taxation might be made to play a very important part in accomplishing the transition of capital from private to collective owner-

ship, not only without anything approaching spoliation, but simply as a matter of justice to the community.

Much of what has been said above as to the transition from private ownership and control of capital to collective ownership and control, would apply to the transition of land to collective ownership and control.

Economically considered as elements in production there are of course fundamental differences between land and capital, which we have no leisure to discuss here. It is also all but universally admitted that there are fundamental differences between property in land and property in commodities ; but it is not necessary to consider these differences and what may be deduced from them. In point of fact, these differences may be pressed beyond their proper importance. Thus if he is called upon to admit that ground-rent, which has been created almost exclusively by the growth and

labor of the community, is collected by individual land-owners, to the robbery and spoliation of the community, every Socialist would say at once that this was precisely one of the evils which Socialism seeks to remedy. But if he was further asked to admit that ground-rent alone is the sufficient explanation of progress and poverty, and that all the advantages of industrial development accrue exclusively to the land-owning class, every intelligent Socialist would say *non sequitur*. In the same way one may admit that property in land rests on a different basis from property in commodities, without construing the fact into a justification of the community's immediately confiscating all landed property, or defending such confiscation on the grounds that it would be simply demanding restitution of stolen property. However important from the stand-point of the political economist, the differences between land and capital, as the object of ownership

and control by individuals, with view to individual profits, are much less important than Mr. George has represented them. The man of wealth purposing to use his wealth with a desire to gain returns for himself, may invest it in land, taking into account the annual return in the shape of rent and the probable rise in the value of the land, or he may invest it in railroad stock with a view to yearly dividends and the future of the road. In either case, the choice of land or capital is determined by what he considers the more profitable investment. Socialism admits the spoliation of the community by private ownership of land, but claims that the spoliation of the community by private ownership and control of the instruments of production is worthy of equal consideration. A. has made his hundred millions by the control of railroads ; B. his hundred millions by investments in real estate ; C. his hundred millions by trade. It is really not worth

while to question which of the three has appropriated most of what should have gone to the community.

Socialists, therefore, would not admit the justice of what is commonly known as "The Single Tax ;" that is, the substitution for all other taxes of a tax on ground-rents, which might be gradually increased till it should absorb them,—inasmuch as such a tax, while restoring to the community a part of that which belonged to the community, would tacitly relinquish the restitution to the community of other wealth to which it was equally entitled. At the same time it is easy to see that if the community once becomes convinced of the wholesale confiscation of what rightfully belongs to it which necessarily results from private ownership and control of land, it will never be satisfied with a lower tax on ground-rents than the advocates of the single tax propose. Such a tax, carefully and intelligently imposed, with the ex-

press purpose, on the one hand, of giving to the community what the community creates, and to the so-called land-owner, on the other, the undisputed use, enjoyment and ownership of all that he has made in the shape of improvements,—such a tax, or part thereof, might furnish the means for paying back to the land-owners any just claims they might have for loss in value to them of property acquired in good faith, or for gradual acquirement by the community of the land.

Be it remembered that in saying this I am not undertaking to solve all the difficulties of the land question, or even to predict what the course of events will be likely to be as the fundamental truths of Socialism shall come to be generally accepted. I have not tried to show how land and capital actually will pass from private to collective ownership and control, but simply how they may do so by gradual and legitimate means, without the least approach to confiscation or

spoliation; and without the least violation of those principles of justice and righteousness which are fundamental to Socialism, and without which Socialism would be as undesirable as it would be impossible.

It remains for me only to state in a few words what seems to me the appropriate work of the advocates of Christian Socialism.

From beginning to end, their work is educational. They see a gigantic evil; but they believe that they also see its cause and its cure. Their work is to make others feel, as they do, how great the evil is, to show them its cause, and convince them of its cure. It would be difficult to say whether this work of education has more to do with ethics or with economics. We have come to see that in reality ethics and economics run side by side, like the rails of a railroad track, and the man who would advance to any understanding of social questions must

use both. The work of the advocates of Christian Socialism is to convince men that the truths of political economy and the teachings of Christ run in parallel lines toward a brighter and ever-brightening future for humanity.

ADDRESS

OF THE

RT. REV. BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D.,
BISHOP OF DURHAM,

DELIVERED AT THE CHURCH CONGRESS IN HULL,
ENGLAND, OCTOBER 1, 1890, AS REPORTED IN
"THE GUARDIAN" OF OCTOBER 8.

APPENDIX.

ADDRESS OF THE RT. REV. BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT,
D.D., BISHOP OF DURHAM,

Delivered at the Church Congress in Hull, England,
October 1, 1890, as reported in *The Guardian* of
October 8.

SOCIALISM.

THE meeting at the Public Rooms on Wednesday evening was occupied with the subject of Socialism, under the two aspects of Modern Theories and Aims, and the Examination of them in the Light of Christianity. The chair was taken by the acting President, the Bishop of Durham. There was a very large attendance.

The Bishop of Durham (the Right Rev. Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D.):

It is not my intention to discuss in this paper any of the representative types of Socialism—the paternal Socialism of

Owen or the state Socialism of Bismarck, the international Socialism of Marx or the Christian Socialism of Maurice, or the evolutionary Socialism of the "Fabian Essays." I wish rather to consider the essential idea which gave, or still gives, vitality and force to these different systems, to indicate the circumstances which invest the idea with paramount importance at the present time, and especially to commend it to the careful study of the younger clergy. The term Socialism has been discredited by its connection with many extravagant and revolutionary schemes, but it is a term which needs to be claimed for nobler uses. It has no necessary affinity with any form of violence or confiscation or class selfishness or financial arrangement. I shall therefore venture to employ it apart from its historical associations as describing a theory of life, and not only a theory of economics. In this sense Socialism is the opposite of individualism, and it is by contrast

with individualism that the true character of Socialism can best be discerned. Individualism and Socialism correspond with opposite views of humanity. Individualism regards humanity as made up of disconnected or warring atoms; Socialism regards it as an organic whole, a vital unity formed by the combination of contributory members mutually interdependent. It follows that Socialism differs from individualism both in method and in aim. The method of Socialism is cooperation; the method of individualism is competition. The one regards man as working with man for a common end; the other regards man as working against man for private gain. The aim of Socialism is the fulfilment of service; the aim of individualism is the attainment of some personal advantage, riches, place, or fame. Socialism seeks such an organization of life as shall secure for every one the most complete development of his powers; individualism seeks primarily the satisfac-

tion of the particular wants of each one, in the hope that the pursuit of private interest will in the end secure public welfare. If men were perfect, with desires and powers harmoniously balanced, both lines of action would lead to the same end. As it is, however, experience shows that limitations must be placed upon the self-assertion of the single man. The growing sense of dependence as life becomes more and more complex necessarily increases the feeling of personal obligation which constrains us each to look to the circumstances of others. At the same time, in the intercourse of a fuller life we learn that our character is impoverished in proportion as we are isolated, and we also learn that evil or wrong in one part of society makes itself felt throughout the whole. But if we admit the central idea of Socialism, that the goal of human endeavor is the common well-being of all alike, sought through conditions which provide for the fullest culture of each man

as opposed to the special development of a race or a class, by the sacrifice of others in slavery or serfdom or necessary subjection, it does not follow that the end can be reached only in one way. The powers of men are different, and equal development does not involve equality. Experience will direct and confirm reform, for life is manifold. But a common end will hallow individuality for more effective service. The single man will not be sacrificed to the society. He will be enabled to bring to it the offering of his disciplined powers and so to realize his freedom. Socialism, as I have defined it, is not, I repeat, committed to any one line of action, but every one who accepts its central thought will recognize certain objects for immediate effort. He will seek to secure that labor shall be acknowledged in its proper dignity as the test of manhood, and that its reward shall be measured, not by the necessities of the indigent, but by its

actual value as contributing to the wealth of the community. He will strive to place masses of men who have no reserve of means in a position of stability and to quicken them by generous ideas ; he will be bold to proclaim that the evils of luxury and penury cannot be met by palliatives ; he will claim that all should confess in action that every power, every endowment, every possession, is not of private use, but a trust to be administered in the name of the Father for their fellow-men. Such view of the social destiny of the individual, with all he has, is brought home to us at the present time by the conception which we have gained of the revolution, or, rather, of the providential ordering of life. There have been, from very early times, dreams of ideal states, fashioned by great thinkers, who felt how far the world in which they lived fell short of the society for which man was made. They looked within for the laws of their imaginary

commonwealths. We have at length a finer guide for our hopes in the records of the past. Studying the course which history has taken, we can forecast the future, for the broad outline of human discipline is clear. In the Old World the ruling thought was the dignity of a race or of a class, to which all beside, in a greater or lesser degree, were made to minister. In the New World, ushered in by the Advent, the ruling thought has been the dignity of man as man, of men as men; and however imperfectly the great truth revealed in the Incarnation has been grasped and embodied, still it has in some sense been brought home to the West little by little, through many lessons. At first, in the Middle Ages, the society was dominant, ordered in a hierarchy of classes; then, at the Reformation, the individual claimed independence, and the voice of authority was followed by the voice of reason. Now, when the complexity of life baffles purely rational

analysis, theoretical freedom has been found to degenerate into anarchy. We catch sight of a fuller harmony in which the offices of the society and of the citizen, traditions and conscience, shall be reconciled. Functions which were once combined have sharply separated as a step toward a more complete union. Here, also, the law of a higher life has been fulfilled, and the parts of the body have been differentiated so that their dependence one upon another may be seen in its beneficent operation. The modern conception of capital and trade, or, rather, isolated facts which foreshadowed them, usury and buying to sell again, were repugnant to mediæval religious feeling. Now, when the range of production and distribution has been indefinitely extended, we have to face problems which mediæval experience could not anticipate and cannot help us to solve. Even in the last century capitalist, producer, and consumer were not infrequently united.

If each of these three classes has now been sharply distinguished and hitherto kept apart by conflicting material interests, it is, if we may trust the teachings of the past, that they may in due time be brought together again in a full, free, and chosen fellowship. The relations which exist between them at present are modern and transitional. Wage-labor, though it appears to be an inevitable step in the evolution of society, is as little fitted to represent finally or adequately the connection of man with man in the production of wealth as at earlier times slavery or serfdom. Our position is one of expectancy and preparation, but we can see the direction of the social movement. We wait for the next stage in the growth of the state, when, in full and generous co-operation, each citizen shall offer the fulness of his own life that he may rejoice in the fulness of the life of the body. Such an issue may appear to be visionary. It is, I

believe, far nearer than we suppose. It is at least the natural outcome of what has gone before. Society has been organized effectively without regard to the individual. The individual has been developed in his independence. It remains to show how the richest variety of individual differences can be made to fulfil the noblest ideal of the state when fellow-laborers seek in the whole the revelation of the true meaning of their separate offerings; and nothing has impressed me more during my years of work than the rapidity and power with which the thoughts of dependence, solidarity, and brotherhood, of our debt to the past and our responsibility for the future, have spread among our countrymen. Men have grown familiar with the principle of combination for limited objects. Such unions are a discipline for a larger fellowship. There is, indeed, enough to sadden us in the selfishness which too often degrades rich and poor alike, but self-respect has grown widely

among those who are poor in material wealth. The consciousness of a high calling and self-denial has quickened to a noble activity many who are oppressed with the burden of great possessions. There is on all sides an increasingly glad recognition of duties answering to opportunities, and if education has created or deepened the desire for reasonable leisure, it has opened springs of enjoyment which riches cannot make more healthy or more satisfying. At the same time, our public wealth is quickly accumulating. Buildings, galleries, gardens bring home to every Englishman that he has an inheritance in the grandeur of his country, and the English family still guards in honor the fundamental types of human communion and fatherhood and brotherhood, which are a sufficient foundation for a kingdom of God. All things, indeed, once more are ready, and a clear call is given to us to prove our faith. Here, then, lies the duty of the Christian teacher—the thoughts of

a true Socialism—the thoughts that men are “one man” in Christ and sons of God, and brethren suffering and rejoicing together; that each touches all and all touches each with an inevitable influence, that as we live by others we can find no rest till we live for others, are fundamental thoughts of the law and the prophets, of Gospel and the Epistles, which he is empowered and bound to make effective under the conditions of modern life. The result is that reflection and experience have at length made them intelligible. To interpret and embody them in a practical form is the office of believers now. They must show that Christianity, which has dealt hitherto with the individual, deals also with the state, with classes, with social conditions, and not only with personal character. In the endeavor to fulfil this duty the past will help them by analogy, but not by example. New questions cannot be settled by tradition. There is an order in the accomplishment

of the Divine counsel. Even great evils are not met and conquered at once. Discerning our own work, we shall not condemn or blame our fathers that they did not anticipate it. They did more or less perfectly the work that was prepared for them to do. We are required not to repeat their service, but, enriched and strengthened by what they have won, to bring the doctrine of the Incarnation to bear upon the dealings of man with man and of nation with nation. As we strive to do this, we shall come to understand the force of the loftiest truths of theology. We shall find that that which is transcendental is, indeed, practical as a motive, an inspiration. We alone, I do not scruple to affirm it, we alone who believe that "The Word became flesh," can keep hope fresh in the face of the sorrows of the world, for we alone know that evil is intrusive and remedial; we alone know that the victory over the world has been won, and that we have to gather with patience

the fruits of the victory. Violence can destroy, but it cannot construct. Love destroys the evil when it replaces the evil by the good. But while we affirm the absolute supremacy of the spiritual and the universal sovereignty of Christ reigning from the Cross, we remember that our work must be done under the conditions of earth, and that it is here on the sordid field of selfish conflicts that we must prepare the kingdom of God. At the same time we recognize that the social problem of to-day, the relations of capital and labor, belongs especially to Englishmen, who, by their national character, have ruled the development of modern industry. As Englishmen have set the problem, so on Englishmen lies the responsibility of solving it, and the position of the English clergy gives them peculiar opportunities for moderating with wise faith discussions which will open the way for the solution. The clergy of the national Church are not a close and isolated

caste; they are drawn from every class; they are trained in sympathy with every variety of thought and culture; they are in habitual contact with all forms of experience; they are lifted above the influence of party by the greatness of their work; they are enabled to labor for a distant end by the greatness of the faith which they proclaim. I ask, then—I ask myself not without sorrowful perplexity—whether we have, in view of the teaching of present facts, considered what God’s counsel for men in creation and redemption is? Whether the state of things in our towns and in our villages either answers or tends to answer the Divine idea? Whether the present distribution of wealth is not perilous alike to those who have and to those who want? Whether we have not accepted the laws of the material order as the laws of all nature? Whether we have pondered over the moral significance of the poor, and whether we have reflected on the wider

application of that principle which it is the glory of medicine to have guarded, that every discovery affecting men's well-being is the property of the race, and not of the finder? I do not enter now on any questions of detail. I desire simply to direct attention to questions which go to the very heart of the Gospel, and I beg the younger clergy, with whatever strength of persuasion I can command, to think over these things; to discuss them with one another, reverently and patiently; to seek to understand and not to silence their adversaries; to win for themselves the truth which gives to error what permanence it has; to remember that bold and sweeping statements come more commonly from doubt or ignorance than from just conviction. But I beg them not to improvise hasty judgments. The personal value of an opinion depends for the most part upon the pains which have been spent in forming it. Zeal, enthusiasm, devotion, are not enough to

guide us in the perplexity of conduct ; we need, above all, knowledge as the basis of action. We have not yet mastered the elements of the problems of society. Theories have been formed from the examination of groups of isolated phenomena ; but life is complex ; we must, indeed ; see our end before we begin our work. But it may be that different ways will be found to lead to it, and, as far as I can judge, the social question of our day will finally receive not one answer, but many. But in one respect all the answers will agree ; all will be religious. Meanwhile, our office as Christian teachers is to proclaim the ideal of the Gospel and to form opinion. And if we do this, if we confess that our mission is to hasten a kingdom of God on earth, and if we ourselves move resolutely forward as the Spirit guides us, I believe that we shall find, through the common offices of our daily intercourse, that peace which springs out of the consciousness of common sacri-

fices made for one end, and the assurance of strength which comes through new victories of faith. We cannot doubt that God is calling us in this age, through the characteristic teachings of science and of history, to seek a new social application of the Gospel. We cannot doubt, therefore, that it is through our obedience to the call that we shall realize its Divine power. The proof of Christianity which is prepared by God, as I believe, for our times, is a Christian society filled with one spirit in two forms—righteousness and love.



3 2044 010 323 36

A FINE IS INCURRED IF THIS BOOK IS
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW.

DEC 17 1972



4126515

681089

BOOK DUE WID

JUN 10 1980



